FOR

CSS, PCS, PMA, PAF, ISSB, POLICE, CUSTOMS, PIA, BANKS AMC, OTS
&
other Civil & Military Exams. Etc.

Group

DISCUSSIONS

M.H. MIAN

AL MANSUR PUBLICATIONS
9-A Circular Road, (Near Rapidoo Tent Service)
Chowk Urdu Bazar, Lahore

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

FOR

All Types of Commission in the Armed Forces of Pakistan
Permanent Commission in the Pakistan Air Force
G.D. (Pilots), Permanent Commission in the
Pakistan Navy. Regular & Short Service
Commission in the Engineers, Medical,
Education, Veterinary and other
******** branches. ********

AND

Central, Provincial and other Allied Service's
Competitive Examinations.

BY

M.H. Mian
and
R.A. Bhatty

AL MANSUR PUBLICATIONS

9-A Circular Road, (Near Rooldoo Tent Service)
Chowk Urdu Bazar, Lahore

Published by :

AL-MANSUR PUBLICATIONS

9 - A Circular Road,
(Near) Rooldo Tent Service
Chowk Urdu Bazar Lahore.

Printed at:

Pakistan Printing Works,
Ratigan Road,
Lahore.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

CONTENTS

Additional Topics with Hints:

بسم اللہ الرحمن الرحیم

GROUP DISCUSSION

Introduction : This is the most important indoor test given by the G.T.O. This test is a sort of public speaking where several members of a group take part. Here each member of the group is to express his opinion on the topic announced by the G.T.O. on the spot. This discussion is not preplanned but is a spontaneous conversation among the members of the group who are strangers to each other. This conversation or a discussion can be compared amongst few persons few enjoining a cup of tea travelling together in a dinning car.

Background : This test was first intropuced for the recruitment or officer in the Army World War I. Since then this test has proved its worth for the selection of suitable persons for the Army and has retained its popularity in the Armed Forces as well as the control superior services of Pakistan. It is observed that the officers at the various levels especially those of Armed Forces have to attend various meetings and conferences and are called upon at a very short notice to discuse some serious situation and are required to give their quick decision on the spot. Thif requires the intelligence alterness potentality and leadership qualities in the officers. For this purpose and to test the potentality of the candidates, the Inter Services Selection Board have included Group Discussion in their tests.

What is Group Discussion ? Group Discussion, as a G.T.O. task resembles an informal, unscheduled chit-chat amongst a group of friends. For instance, if eight or ten students get together in the students' ante-room or in the university office house or in a picnic party or in a railway waiting-room, they will naturally not remain silent, but will talk about various matters; each one expressing his views freely. The subject discussed may relate to sports, rail travel, girl students, examinations, popular pictures, favourite film stars and so forth. In these discussions no one is formally appointed as the chairman or president. There are no proposers, seconders etc. No one is asked to take sides as in a formal debate. There is no question of voting or arriving at any decision. Each student just expresses his views on the subject, as he feels about it. If someone criticises his views he may answer the criticism in a friendly manner. If he finds better views than his own are expressed by others, he may change his original views. The same factors are applicable to the Group Discussion organised by the G.T.O. The only difference is that the subjects for discussion are given by G.T.O. Secondly, definite time limit is provided in G.T.O.'s Group Discussion.

This informal group discussion, first of all enables the members of the group to understand each other better. The candidates notice and compare unconsciously the verbal facility, depth of knowledge, breadth of ideas, logical reasoning and convincing ability of one another. The observer will see the impact created by each candidate on the group.

He will note as to who expresses his ideas well, who has sound arguments, who shows keenness and interest, who has sufficient knowledge on the subject, who succeeds in convincing the group, who has a logical and systematic approach, who reveals the tendency to co-operate, who does the co-ordination, who is liked by the group and so on.

Why Group Discussion? The candidate must know why he is tested as member of a group. If we realise that man is a social animal and no individual lives in that isolation, we can at once see the importance of group testing. As generally man has to live in society, so a member of the Armed Forces has to live in company of his fellow members, whether they be his equals, superiors or subordinates. In group testing, the actual conditions which an officer of the services may have to face in his day to day life is stimulated with necessary modifications to suit the testing of the inexperienced candidates. This facilitates the assessment of the candidate's personality in personality in psychological terms is only the behaviour pattern of an individual as he reacts to varying situations. Further, individually a person may be a genius. But if he is not able to fit in socially with the other personnel in the organisation, he is no good to the organisation. In fact his inclusion in the organisation may prove injurious to the realisation of its aims or goals. Besides, certain individuals may be able to show great capacity for work etc. when alone. But when placed as member of a group, they may become shy, inhibited or moody. Since the tasks in the services generally involve team-work and co-operative effort, it becomes necessary to test the group-worthiness of the candidate.

What Factors Contribute to Group-Worthiness? The primary factor which determines the candidate's group-worthiness is his ability to fit into the group, to bind it together as a single entity and to influence the group towards the attainment of the group goals.

The next important factor is the candidate's personal ability to do the job in hand. We may even call it as one's professional efficiency and it includes his intelligence ; physical fitness, problem solving faculty, dynamic qualities and the ability to communicate effectively.

The third important factor concerns the candidate's ability to stand up to physical and mental stresses and difficulties. He should not wait and give way under stress or get upset. On the other hand he should be able to remain balanced, calm and collected in the face of tremendous odds and stresses. There will be individual rivalries and differences of opinion in the group. There will arise the conflict between the individual's self-interest and the group interest. In the face of such conflicts and difficulties, the candidate should not lose self-control. He should not get frustrated or give way to temper.

The candidate's persuasive ability is the fourth important factor. Persuasion can be accomplished by two main methods. The first one is to convince others by verbal technique. The ability to talk and express effectively counts here to a great extent. The second way is to persuade others by personal conduct and results achieved. Acting

rather than words counts in this method. The candidate has to adopt both these methods to persuade other members of his group to accept his views.

The next important factor is the co-operative and positive approach of the candidate towards group efforts. Whether his views are accepted or rejected, whether he is given the important role or not, the candidate must always co-operate with the other members of the group. His approach should be positive and constructive. He should avoid serious criticism of other's views. He must give an earnest trial to the course of action suggested by the group, although he may disagree with it personally.

The final and perhaps the most important factor is the candidate's ability to provide leadership. Most of the group tasks are leaderless group tasks. No one is officially designated as leader or commander in such tasks. As a group cannot however effectively function without some sort of a leader or leaders, the vacuum will be filled in by those candidates who display the leadership ability. In fact one of the principal aim of the G.T.O. tests is to find out who reveals such natural leadership qualities. If the candidate shows all the qualities discussed in the different factors which constitute group-worthiness, he will automatically be accepted as the leader or one of the leaders of the group. In this context the candidate must understand that the leader is not one who only gives orders. He has to work like others in the group, perhaps even more than the others. He has to be a follower also at times, especially when there are more leaders than one in the group.

Advantages of Group Discussion : Following are some of the advantages of group discussion :

(1) Group discussion reveals the personality of each member of the group and their leadership qualities are crystallised out.

(2) During group discussion each member know each other, understand each other and assess their position in the group.

(3) Group discussion stimulates thinking. The members in the group think freely and without any prejudice and get crystal clear picture of the topic under discussion.

(4) The members of the group get a practice of speaking in a group and thus shed their shyness.

(5) The members of the group enlarge their sphere of knowledge and learn many new things during group discussion.

The Importance of Group Discussion : The Group Discussion task is one of the extremely important exercises in the G.T.O. test, as the candidate here creates the first impression about himself on the G.T O. and on the other members of his group. We already know the significance of the first impression Besides, the G.T.O's assessment, the candidate's standing in the group and his role in subsequent group tasks will be greatly influenced by his performance in the group discussion. Since it is very difficult to change the first impression, the candidate must go all out and do his best in this first exercise in order

to create a favourable impression both on the G.T.O. and on the other group members.

Secondly, the Group Discussion task as we have seen is a leaderless group exercise. Therefore someone has to take on the task of co-ordinating the discussion. It must be ensured that all do not speak at the same time and a few do not monopolise the entire discussion. There must be some order. Each candidate must be given an opportunity to state his views. The shy and the hesitant members should be encouraged to speak. The one who takes on this co-ordinating function, will automatically be acting as the leader. Thus in this exercise the candidate gets the opportunity to reveal his leadership qualities If the candidate establishes himself as the natural leader in this first exercise, the group will automatically look up to him in subsequent exercises for leadership.

Qualities required for Group Discussion ?

1. *Power of expression*—Ability to express ideas clearly, fluently and logically.

2. *Knowledge of the subject*—Range of ideas and depth of thoughts.

3. *Social adaptability*—Co-operative attitude, readiness to own mistakes, ability to accept criticism gracefully, consideration for the feelings of others.

4. *Flexibility*—Not being one-track minded or rigid, absence of selfish attitude, not being a bully.

5. *Liveliness*—Interest, urge, keenness, cheerful temperament.

6. *Confidence and courage*—Self-confidence, courage of one's convictions, determination, ability to stand up to bullying, faith in his own ability.

7. *Extent of participation*—How often and how much the candidate speaks.

8. *Ability to exert influence on the group*—The impression created on others, power to create strong impact, ability to motivate and sell one's ideas.

General Method conduct at the I.S.S.B. : The group of 8 to 10 candidates will be seated in the numerical order of their chest numbers in a circle, each facing the rest. The G.T.O. will take his seat outside the circle. First there will be mutual introductions and each candidate will introduce himself by saying a few words about himself such as the place he has come from, his educational qualifications, his hobbies games etc. The G.T.O. will then give a brief outline of the G.T.O. tests. Thereafter the Group Discussion exercise will start.

In this task, to begin with, generally two subjects will be read out to the candidates, *e.g.*,

(*a*) "Pen is mightier than sword."

(*b*) "It is better to marry late than early in life."

The candidates will then be asked to choose between themselves one of the two subjects for discussion. The subject favoured by the majority of the candidates will be finally announced by the G.T.O.

for discussion. Usually about 20 minutes are given to discuss the first subject. After the time limit is over, the G.T.O. will read out another subject and ask the group to discuss the same. The time for the second subject will also be approximately 20 minutes. When the candidates are expressing their views and talking to one another, the G.T.O. will not interfere. Generally he will remain as a silent observer, nothing what is going on and listening to what is being said. Depending upon the extent of participation by the candidates, the G.T.O may alter the time limits or even given additional topics for discussion.

Advice to the candidates :

1. Be active and interested in the discussion. You must be alive to what is going on in the group and should not allow your mind to wander away. Be cheerful and smiling. Look at the individual who is talking.

2. Listen to the briefing of the G.T.O. carefully. Grasp and understand correctly the subjects offered for discussion.

3. Take the lead if you can in determining the choice of the first subject. If someone else has taken the lead, you express your views clearly and state why you prefer that particular subject for discussion. Do not say that you know more facts about that subject and hence it should be discussed. It is selfish and nobody is interested in what you want. You must argue as to why it is advantageous for the group and for others to discuss a particular subject, *e g*, it is the burning topic of the day and the candidates will like to talk about it or it is an exciting and interesting topic and so on.

4. Naturally every one will be keen to do the talking and impress the G.T.O. You must find the earliest opportunity to express your ideas. If no opportunity is given, you can request the whole group to give you a hearing, *e.g*, "Gentlemen, I have listened to the arguments you all have advanced. But there is one very important and interesting aspect to which I wish to draw your attention. Will you permit me to explain it ?"

5. Another way to find an opportunity is to address yourself to the candidate, who is presently speaking *e.g.*, "No. 5, you have indeed given some very sound arguments. Nevertheless, I wish to add one important point which you all will find to be very interesting. May I . . ."

6. Talk with confidence and self assurance. Speak to the whole group, looking each candidate in the eye in turn. Do not keep looking at the G.T.O. or address yourself to him.

7. Raise your voice as required. Do not mumble or talk aside. Be forceful in your approach to gain the attention of the group. It does not mean bullying. Avoid the even, monotonous tone. You must be crisp and energetic.

8. Speak slowly and deliberately. Do not rush your words. The group must understand what you are saying. Avoid shy, hesitant or inhibited.

9. Do not worry about making some grammatical mistakes. It is the interest and the matter you put across that counts.

10. Think and marshal your ideas. You cannot talk unless you have something to say. What you say must be relevant and interesting. You will get plenty of ideas, if only you concentrate on what is being said on the subject by others. You will agree or disagree with the ideas expressed and soon you will start getting your own independent ideas on the subject.

11. There must be logic and reasoning in your arguments. Otherwise you will not be able to convince others. Avoid self-contradictions.

12 Do not be rigid in your views. Accept criticism gracefully. Own your mistakes readily. Do not feel offended or sulky, if someone picks flaws in your arguments. Change your views willingly if your original opinions are proved to be wrong.

13. Be considerate to the feeling of others. Remember it is a friendly discussion and co-operation is more important. Do not shout at others. Be polite and genial. If someone has not spoken and wishes to say something, request others to give him a hearing. Be helpful, accommodative and give good encouragement to all group members.

14. Be accurate in your statements. Do not try to bluff.

15. Do not engage yourself in side or sub group conversations. If more that one individual is taking at the same time, politely request for order and appeal for co-operation. In such situations you must take the lead and do the co ordination work.

16. Practice group discussion with your friends. Ponder and contemplate on the likely subjects. Gather information and expand your knowledge. Learn how to command attention of the group when you talk.

17. Although it is not a must that you should speak first, make use of the opportunity whenever you can. But it is absolutely essential that you do talk and express your views during the Group Discussion. What is more, you must talk from time to time and say as much as you can on the subject. Remember that you cannot impress others unless you talk effectively.

18. Avoid repetition and irrelevant material.

19. Ask questions from others if you have reasonable doubts. Seek clarifications where necessary.

20. Remember that ideas can rule the world only if they are effectively communicated. Speech is one of the most powerful means of communication. Physical deformities, irritating mannerisms, a bad way of standing or sitting, poor voice and all other such defects and drawbacks will be forgiven and forgotten, if speaker can put across intelligent and interesting ideas with enthusiasm and conviction.

Group Discussion No. 1

Topic :

SHOULD WE ENCOURAGE LOVE MARRIAGE OR ARRANGED MARRIAGE IN PAKISTAN

(*P.M.A. Long Course*)

G.T.O. Well, gentlemen, since sooner or later all of you are going to face the dilemma of marriage, I am sure you would like to discuss the merits of love-marriage versus marriage arranged by parents. Let us hear your views on the subject.

1st candidate : (Addressing the G.T.O).—I thank you for giving us an interesting topic, sir. (Addressing the group) Gentlemen, I must confess that I am strongly in favour of young people choosing their own partners in life, because, I believe that, that is how nature intended it to be and that is how nature operates in all other animals and birds.

I think marriage is a relationship of love and companionship and should be treated as such to produce the best results. When the parents have a say in the matter of marriage, they often get side-tracked by other considerations like money, family connections, status and caste, etc.

2nd candidate : Gentlemen, allow me to say that I don't entirely agree with the views, just expressed. I feel that, on the contrary, parents are better qualified to select suitable life partners for their children because their choice is bound to be more rational and mature. It is well known that 'love is blind' and young people in love usually do not stop to consider whether the person they adore is also capable of making a success of married life. In their case, passion takes an upper hand over sound judgement. Therefore, I am strongly of the opinion that the selection of a life partner should be left to more mature judgement.

3rd candidate : Friends, this may be true, but I think marriage is a gamble either way. After all, when parents decide a relationship, they are seldom in position to know the girl well enough. I mean, they can only know about the family background and outward appearance of the girl, her educational attainments or her other apparent accomplishments like proficiency in household affairs as cooking, knitting and tailoring, but they cannot be aware of her personality traits. You would agree with me that it is her basic temperament and inherent nature which leads to the success or otherwise of her married life rather than her apparent qualities like looks and bearing or even her family connections. Therefore I would stress tha

young men and women should be allowed to select partners of their choice suiting each others temperament.

4th candidate : Gentlemen, I do not agree with the opinion expressed by candidate No. 3. I am convinced that family connections certainly do influence a person's character and temperament. Girls coming from families which have learnt to live together in harmony are certainly likely to make better wives. Isn't it a well known fact that children brought up in broken homes develop their own Psychological problems and they are poor marriage risks.

5th candidate : My friends, it seems, we are assuming straight-away that only parents can consider all aspects before deciding on a relationship and young men just pick up for a wife the first girl they come across when they are grown up. That is farthest from the truth. What makes you think that a young man or girl will not take full stock of the situation before embarking on a love affairs ? All young-men and women are not like the typical hero or heroine of the Pakistani films who has to convert his or her first love affair into a marriage. In an atmosphere of free love, a young man ought to fully understand his girl friend before proposing to her. And during the courtship, he has the best opportunity to study his girl friend. He can always break off if he finds that the girl is not likely to make a good wife. Also the girl has the choice to accept or reject a suitor.

6th candidate : Gentlemen, I think success in marriage is a matter of chance either way. We have seen failures even in love marriage and let us not forget that our fathers and grandfathers and their forefathers had all enjoyed arranged marriages and surely our culture and society is none the worse for it. This new fangled clamour for love marriage is merely the influence of western films and culture on our life. I am therefore firm in my opinion that arranged marriages are best suited for our country.

7th candidate : Friends, I wish to emphasise that much can be said on both sides. But this argument on love marriage versus arranged marriage is gradually losing its point because in the modern society, the segregation of sexes is becoming less strict and many wise parents encourage their grown up children to mix freely with members of the opposite sex. Not only that. They even educate them about the qualities to look for in the spouses they might choose. Also since the custom of child marriage has disappeared, and most young men and women are marrying only when they are in early twenties or late teens, they are able to have a fair say in the choice of their partners. In fact, in most cases, the boy and girl have the full consent of their parents for their developing friendship. This, in my opinion, is the ideal situation.

8th candidate : Well, the ideal situation that my friend has described just now is not what we can all look forward to. So let us keep the prevailing conditions in view and be realistic. Whatever be the merits and demerits of the so-called love marriage, it has come to say. The point is that with the break of the joint family system,

with the spread of education and greater employment facilities for women, it is inevitable that the parental influence should diminish. And hence young people in future are bound to be more free in the choice of their spouses, at least in the towns and cities. I, therefore, suppose the best thing for the young people would be generally to respect the wishes of their elders while deciding to go steady with their friends of the opposite sex and perhaps the best thing for the elders would be to take it easy and relax. In the changed society, they should prefer the role of marriage counsellers to that of the match makers.

3rd candidate : Gentlemen, after all this discussion, the fact remains that success in marriage is more of good luck and an unsuccessful marriage is a misery as much for the man as for the lady. Love marriage or arranged marriage, the net result of the event, as far as the man is concerned, is life long slavery for him. I can't forget George Bernad Shaw's best advice to young men contemplating marriage : "Stay out of it as long as you can." And having taken his advice, I am glad that not only do I hope to remain a free man, I don't even have to be worried about the pros and cons of a love marriage.

1st candidate : Thank you, my friend, for giving that light touch to the discussion. I for one, am going to marry as soon as I can reasonably support a wife and I intend to marry for one and only one consideration. And that is 'love'

6th candidate : God bless you and I hope you will not regret it.

GTO : Right gentlemen, I think we have had a very lovely discussion. Thank you very much. We will now switch over to another subject.

Group Discussion No. 2

Topic :

IS DOWRY SYSTEM AN EVIL IN PAKISTAN ?

P.M.A. Long Course)

Candidate No. 1 : Well, friends lot of talk is done these days against our well-established system of dowry at the time of marriage. Somehow, I do not understand the logic of the criticism offered against dowry.

I have often been thinking that at times in our zeal to do reforms in our social customs we go too far. There is a considerable force in the logic which prompted our forefathers to introduce this system. Life actually starts after marriage when a house is set up. Dowry is nothing but assistance to the newly wedded couple in setting up their home. I feel, therefore, that this practice should continue.

Candidate No 2 : I do not deny that when our forefathers brought this practice into being dowry system was a necessity. Living conditions were then different. Customs have entirely changed. On the top of all security to life has undergone a material change. Dowry was given to provide for security against unforeseen happenings. We have now different ways of providing for security. It is therefore, not at all needed now.

Candidate No. 3 : Sir, it is surprising that with all the evils in dowry system, we should have especially amongst youngmen advocates of dowry system. If older people speak of it with favour it is understandable to some extent. They were brought up in these environments. They find it difficult to come out of their old thoughts, their old grooves. Dowry to them was also a sign of vain glory. It was measure of extorting money from the poor parents of girls. Do we not know of or hear of innumerable cases where daughters of poor parents cannot get married for a long time simply because their parents are not in a position to arrange the dowry demands ? Is it not a social curse, Sir ? Is it not a crime ? Instances where married women have been given up because the promised dowry could not be arranged by the parents are numerous In the face of such happenings continuance of dowry system is a slur, it should be totally stopped.

Candidate No 4 : Yes, Sir, I feel giving of dowry or demanding of dowry should be made a criminal offence. It should not remain a civil offence only. I was an eye witness to a very unfortunate incident in our village months ago. A marriage party returned in the midst of rituals simply because the father of the bride could not pay the promised sum to the bridegroom's father. The wailings and persuasion of the girl's father failed, to produce any effect in the cold inhuman mind of his counter-part on the boy's side. It is a pity that I could not do any thing. A week later we heard that the girl's father committed suicide. What was the root cause of this tragedy in that family? Dowry simply dowry. This practice should, therefore, be banished by law.

Candidate No. 5 : Sir, I am also not in favour of dowry system. But I do not think that legislation can do much in this respect. Legislations on various social matters have been brought in to being but their ineffectiveness is known to every one. Unless there is change of hearts it is not possible to do away with a custom which is rooted so deeply in our ways of thinking and in our customs. I would, therefore, suggest that there should be large scale education of masses against this evil which has crept far into us. Parents are humiliated because of dowry. I will also say that we youngmen should take it upon ourselves to spread propaganda against dowry amongst youngmen. If youngmen refuse to accept it the system of dowry will automatically die in course of time.

Candidate No. 6 : Sir, I have listened to the entire discussion with great attention. You may call me a backward or conservative person. I may also be told that I am a greedy man but I do not mind. I somehow do not agree with the view that the dowry system is an

evil. I feel it is a necessity. It is a way of investment for a good cause. What is bad is the excessive demand of dowry. Those who make a certain amount of dowry as a pre-condition to marriage are anti-social persons. They are black-hearted people and the society should condemn these persons instead of condemning an institution which has sacred roots. The dowry was given as a sort of gift to the daughter by her parents which was to stand her in goodstead in time of need in her dark days. Why should we deprive a daughter of this right and that too for the sake of a few anti-social elements here and there. I think we should have associations to bring moral pressure on such anti-social persons and see to it that the evil is reduced to the minimum.

Candidate No. 7 : Sir, dowry can neither be abolished nor controlled by legislation unless girls come forward and refuse to marry boys who or whose parents demand dowry. It may also be said that this will create a problem for marriage. It may also be said that by so doing only the parents of poor girls will be exposed. This will not happen. And even if it happens, it will only be a temporary affair. The evil have to be met by the girls themselves. It is only they who can provide an answer to the greed of men in this matter. Let women make societies of their own and let them infuse education, awakening and courage among their members to fight the evil. The dowry system, like this I am sure will come to an end without much trouble.

Candidate No. 8 : Sir, we are making much fuss about nothing. I do not think dowry is any such problem on a big scale. After all no society is free from black sheep. And so it is the case with those who specialize in the business, I must say so, of dowry.

Has any body ever cared to take statistics as to how many cases of exploitation of dowry system occure every year ? What is the percentage of such cases ? My impression is that the percentage will be very negligible. I am sure about it. The trouble does not lie with the system. It also does not lie with evil itself. It lies with those who make a mountain out of a mole hill by giving isolated cases of unfortunate exploitation maximum possible publicity. The problem also dces not exist in the country as a whole. It is only confined to certain castes. Only if local conscience is strong, such isolated cases of dowry can be set right.

Candidate No. 9 : Sir, I think I should round up the discussion by saying as I feel, that dowry system is now out of date. It has been said that girls should be given dowry for security purposes. It is an old argument. Parents now spend money on giving education to their daughters. They are equipped to earn their own living as equal partners with their husbands. Burdening the parents with dowry is, therefore, not only unjustified but immoral. The evil I think exists only in the richer classes of people. In middle classes it is dying out. It is true that such evils should be tackled with methods leading to the change of hearts but where persuasion fails, legislation is helpful and all acts in this respect should be observed and defaulter should be severely punished.

Well, Gentlemen we have sufficiently discussed that matter and the discussion may now be closed.

The discussion thus comes to an end. The candidates disperse. The group-testing officer finalises his assessment of the arguments advanced by each candidate and the manner in which each of candidate took part. His impressions are conveyed to the President of the Board. It does not matter what line of reasoning towards a subject a candidate adopts. It is bound to differ. All that matters is that whatever arguments are given, they should be quick, brief and clear. It is the clarity, initiative and reasonable assertiveness which carry the day.

Group Discussion No. 3

PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN PAKISTAN

1st Candidate. The G.T.O. Sir, and friends! *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

Pakistan has got many problems. The problem of unemployment is one of them. There is a large number of people who run hither and thither in search of jobs.

2nd Candidate. There are three main kinds of unemployment in Pakistan. There is unemployment in agriculture, industry and among the educated people. The unemployment in the agricultural field is due to many reasons. There is pressure of population on land. The farmer is not in a position to employ labourers in his land. The farmer has to work in his fields only for a little time in a year, whereas he remains unemployed during the remaining time of the year. Hence, he cannot employ any people in his lands. The failure of the moonsoons also cause him a great loss. On account of these various causes, the state of unemployment in agriculture in Pakistan remains serious.

3rd Candidate. The unemployment in the industrial field are also numerous. Pakistan's industry is undeveloped and it cannot absorb more men. As our resources are meagre, hence, it is difficult for us to develop it. There have also been depressions in industry which increased unemployment.

4th Candidate. The unemployment in Pakistan can be reduced by developing our industry. Efforts can be made for removing inefficiency in the industrial sphere. The industrial output in our industrial concerns can be increased. Moreover, there is also a great scope for installing more mills and factories in the country. There is a great scope for oil industry in Pakistan. The expansion of industry in Pakistan is a great source for reducing unemployment in our country.

5th Candidate. The unemployment in Pakistan can be reduced by expanding textile industry. Our country possesses tremendous possibilities for a thriving textile industry. The traditional tailoring skill in Pakistan needs to be promoted. Our country has not even begun to explore the tremendous potentialities in modern textile industry. There is an abundance of skilled tailors in our country and good quality fabrics were being produced in the country. So the basis for a thriving textile industry in our country existed. The Pakistan Government could pioneer a textile industry in the country. The production of uniforms for the members of the Armed Forces, the Militia and the Police as well as large enterprises like the Pakistan International Airlines should be done in a modern textile factory. This would not only reduce unemployment in our country, but it would be economical and would also help to improve the quality and appearance of the uniforms. There are also great export possibilities for nicely-designed and good quality manufactured textile products to Europe, Muslim Middle East, Muslim Africa and other countries. These opportunities were being missed by entreprisers and exporters in our country. A modern textile factory did not cost much as some other industrial installation. I am surprised that few people in our country had paid attention to the potentialities in this field.

6th Candidate. The unemployment in Pakistan is mainly due to the defective planning. It arises from defective economic system. If production and consumption are planned and balanced in a proper way, the problem of unemployment in Pakistan can be minimised to a great extent.

7th Candidate. There are many minerals in Pakistan. The unemployment in our country can be minimised by developing industries for utilising these minerals. There is a good quality of copper which is available in the district of Chagi in Baluchistan province. It is also available in the hills of Kath, and Parachana in the Punjab province. Copper was discovered in the district of Chagi in 1955 but no development has been made by Pakistan. If Pakistan might have established industry for utilizing these minerals, the unemployment might have reduced to a great extent in Pakistan.

8th Candidate. Pakistan has launched from May, 1973 an aggressive programme for providing immediate employment to educated skilled people. Our country has decided to provide interim employment for those possessing technical and professional diplomas or higher qualifications. The volunteers enrolled under this scheme

would receive a standard stipend depending on their qualifications and experience. Our country has also established a National Engineering Corporation to provide employment for engineers. The first phase of the programme is to cover only scientists, engineers and technicians. The programme was primarily for a partial solution of the problem of educated unemployment in the urban areas.

Group Discussion No. 4

USES AND ABUSES OF CINEMA

1st Candidate Gentlmen, ***Aslam-o-Alaikum***.

Cinema is the main factor for adversely affecting the moral of both young men and women, who form the bulk of cinema-goers. A picture necessarily has a love story. Almost, all the pictures that are released in Pakistan and in any part of the world, are always full of passionate scene of sex and false love affairs. The young men and women who attend cinemas try to enact in their daily lives. The young men and women who are immatured, are swept by their wrongly instigated emotions, and, thus, results in the occurrence of unfortunate countless love tragedies. This sort of destruction is increasing day by day.

2nd Candidate Crime and violence is shown in the films of the cinema and television. Our censor code provides for the banning of such films. But, in actual enforcement, the government is very much laxing. Such films incite the young men to be violent. They teach those already thinking of, or addicted to, crime ingenious methods of crime and violence.

3rd Candidate The morale of the cinema-going people is further deteriorated by the presence of bad characters, loose characters and illiterate persons in the cinema houses The cinema houses have become scenes of all social evils Drunkards, pick-pockets and bad characters hover round the cinema houses. The young men and women assemble in the cinema to make love. All types of vices are performed both in and around the cinema houses.

4th Candidate. Judging from the health point of view, we again, find that cinema is very harmful. Mostly, the cinema houses are not properly ventilated. Side air-conditions are not provided for. To sit in a dark hall, inhaling the foul air breathed out by hundreds of cinema lovers, cannot be beneficial to good health. Numerous men and women have also lost their eyesight and have weakened their eyesight.

5th Candidate The cinema is also a great waste of time. The waste of time is very harmful for students, peasants, businessmen and all other people. Most of the students waste their time in cinemas and fail in examinations. In a similar manner, people of all walks of life waste much of their time in cinemas and thus harm the speed and progress of their work. The cinema-goers cause harm to their own work and interest, in this very world, and the harm which they have to face in the Hereafter is still far greater. There is a hadith that on the Day of judgement every person will be asked to answer many questions, out of which one question will be as to how he or she had spent his or her life in this world. This fact brings to the notice of the mankind, the aweful effects of waste of time in this world.

6th Candidate. The waste of money in cinema is also equally harmful. The poor people who cannot afford a cup of tea or a cup of milk, or a little fruit every day, they quite gladly and foolishly spend their hard-earned mony in buying tickets of cinemas.

The unfortunate people take it as a fashion to entertain themselves and their friends in a cinema house.

7th Candidate. But apart from all these disadvantages, the cinema has also got some advantages. The cinema is one of the wornderful inventions of science in our times It is a source of entertainment. It also provides some educative value. It is also a main industry of a country There are also millions of studios, producers, distributers, exhibitors, actors, etc., who get employment in this industry.

8th Candidate. No doubt, the cinema is a wonderful invention of the present age, but it has not been used for constructive purposes It has been used for the destruction of the characters of all people. It cannot be given the name of "an industry" because it does not bring any gain to the country But on the other hand, it ruins the people as well as the country. The cinemas supply employment to those inhuman persons, who spoil the characters of the masses of the

country. It also brings harm and disgrace to the country. The so-called "employment in the cinema industry" can be compared to some decoits who have been employed by a leader decoit. No doubt, it is an employment of some decoits, but it is all meant to rob, loot and kill innocent passengers, villagers, citizens and other people of the country. No sensible man will recommend the so-called "employment" as beneficial for a country.

9th Candidate. Please, let me quote an instance from the Quran, which proves that a thing which has got more disadvantages than advantages, then that thing is strictly prohibited in Islam. Allah quotes an instance of wine and says that it has been prohibited, because its harms surpass its uses. Referring to the Quran **2 : 219**, we find that Allah commands thus :

"They ask you (O Prophet Muhammad—may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) about the wine and the gambling. Say : "There is a great sin in both of them and some advantages for **the** mankind, but their sin is far greater than their advantage."

———

Group Discussion No. 5

WAR IS INEVITABLE

Ist Candidate. G.T.O,, Sir and friends ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum*.

We refer to the history of the world and find that the world has always been torn out by wars. There have been wars between the Muslims and the *Kafirs* (disbelievers), wars between nations, wars between the various sects of the disbelievers, wars between the foreigners and their subjects, etc. Again, we find at present that war exists in various kinds in Cambodia, Laos, Middle East, Philippines, Kashmir, Cyprus, West German borders and in a lot of other places. All these happenings go to prove that war is inevitable.

2nd Candidate. So long as aggression of a strong country over a weak country, strong nation over a weak nation continues, wars will be continued in the world. It is a natural law that a pressed man always tries to snatch power from the strong aggressive hand. This fact makes wars inevitable in the world.

3rd Candidate. There is also another cause of conflict in the world. The instinct of fighting is one of the main human characteristics and the desire for adventure is a part of human nature. My friend Mr. Ist Candidate had justly traced history of conflict of the human race throughout the ages. Let me add that from the very recorded history, war has been a main feature of man's life in this world. Historical calculations help us to know that against every

single year of peace, there have been 13 years of war. Penetrating into the early history of mankind, we find that Greece, Rome, Egypt, India, etc. is full of tales of war and conquest. Brave men showed their worth and stood victorious. The legendary heroes continue to inspire young people for bringing glory to their lands through wars. War is thus, very much in the human nature and is inevitable.

4th Candidate. If we remove the causes which bring war in the world, then we can eliminate the war or at least we can prolong the periods of peace. We find that a man is often entangled in diseases. As soon as he removes the root causes of those diseases, he is, again, a healthy man. Following this principle, we can be able to remove the horrors of war from the mankind. Man has made great progress in the way of civilization. He has learnt to tame and restrain his brute emotions and instincts so that there is a hope of good future for mankind. The mankind has suffered heavily on account of wars.

The root cause of wars in the world is aggression of one country over another country, aggression of one nation over another nation. Aggression in the world can be removed only by Islam.

5th Candidate. Mr. 4th Candidate is very true in his views. Islam gives balanced laws to mankind. It removes aggression. Referring to the Quran 2 : 190, we find that Allah says thus :

"And fight in the cause of Allah against those who fight against you, but do not transgress. Surely, Allah does not love the transgressors."

Group Discussion No. 6

CO-EDUCATION—SHOULD IT BE ENCOURAGED IN PAKISTAN ?

1st Candidate. Gentlmen, *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

We are fortunate to get independence from the foreign and *Kafir* British rule. We are thankful to Allah for that. After doing away with the foreign rule, we are in a position to follow our own Islamic way of life. Shortly, after achieving liberation, we have done away with most of the ideals and practices which over-grappled us. We are endeavouring to purify our educational system and to purge it of British dark-spots! Co-education is also one of the wretched gifts of the *Kafir* British rule. We should remove it.

2nd Candidate. On account of old system of co-education of the British rule, we witness a worst kind of degeneration in our students. Almost daily, we hear of nasty kind of love affairs between a boy and

a girl. Let me say in clear words that it is the demoralizing and defective system of co-education which breeds all kinds of corruption among the students, whether a boy or a girl.

3rd Candidate. Please, let me add that Pakistan is a country of the Muslims. Our girls are renowned for their Islamic chastity and grace. If that is lost, then nothing remains of their womanhood. The Western system of co-education has poisoned the sacred atmosphere of our educational institutions. As my earlier two friends, I am also against the encouragement of co-education in our Islamic country—Pakistan.

4th Candidate. Co-education is the backbone of the progressive development of modern society. There are historical records which proved that in the past ages boys and girls used to study together. The famous Greek traveller Magasthanese tells us that in the Taxila and Nalanda Universities, both boys and girls received every branch of knowledge under able scholars. Moreover, we have to keep pace with the changing times. We should discourage conservatism and backward ideas, and in their place, create a new cosmos of broad-minded liberalism. Co-education is one of the indispensable elements of our modern age. Co-education makes the girls perfect and ideal. It also broadens their outlook in their social, political, intellectual and ethical horizon. I recommend co-education.

5th Candidate. The 4th Candidate has advocated the cause of the disbelieving mankind. He has expressed un-Islamic views. He has tried to befool the Muslims of the world. Let me answer all his assertions item-wise. He describes that co-education is the backbone of the progressive development of modern society. Please, let me take an instance of a nation which was a staunch supporter of co-education in the world. It is the British nation. We have seen that these supporters of co-education had, once, dominated over three quarters of the world. But in a short while, downfall encircled them and they had to go back in their own land from where they had expanded in other territories. Now, Ireland is struggling to secure separation from Britain. The main cause of the downfall of this nation is the liberation which they have extended to their women. It is due to the spirit of co-education which they have promoted among the boys and the girls. As regards the impression of the Greek traveller about the co-education in the universities of Taxila and Nolanda, we can say that he might have seen the boys and girls studying together in classes, but he must have, altogether, ignored the bad and immoral effects of this education. That traveller being a non-Muslim could not judge the bad and ruinous effects of co-education. Even today, the ruinous effects of co-education are visible in all the Western countries. We can see that boys and girls make love affairs in their common educational institutions. They enter into marriage alliance, according to their own wishes, but later on, they are entangled in troubles. Then, we see that both married men and women take placards in their hands and wander

in main ba irs of their cities to protest against each other. My able friend must take a lesson from them and must save his own country from the destructive effects of co-education as soon as possible.

6th Candidate. My able friend Mr. 5th Candidate has made a very reasonable and current reference against the poisonous effect of co-education. I will not give more references from the Quran and the Hadith in support of my case, but only one instance from Hadith. There is a hadith which says that even father of a young girl should not sit in an isolation with her Islam puts just restrictions on mankind which promote peace among them Following the tenets of Islam, nobody can recommend co-education. The institutions of co-education bring failure to both man and woman in this very world and the Hereafter

7th Candidate Islam lays great stress on the chastity of both man and woman. It blocks all ways leadings to *zina*. The Arabic word *zina* denotes unlawful sexual intercourse between any male and female, whether married or not, who do not stand to each other in the relation of husband and wife. It includes both adultery and fornication, where "adultery" means illicit sexual intercourse of two persons either of whom is married to a third person" and "fornication" means "illicit sexual intercourse of unmarried persons". Islam attaches utmost importance to the checking up of *zina*. It blocks all ways and paths leading to it. Allah commands sex purity for both man and woman, at all times before marriage, during marriage and also in time of widowhood, etc. For that purpose, Islam prohibits co-education, cinema, clubs, etc., where men and women meet, and all sorts of illegal means that lead to that wretched inhuman way.

8th Candidate. My learned brother Mr. 7th candidate has expressed very useful Islamic views against co-education. I can quote some instances from the Quran where Allah commands the whole mankind to shut all the doors to *zina* Allah in the Quran 17 : 32 says :

> "(O mankind) ! do not go near *zina*, surely, it is a foul thing and an evil way". Again, Allah in the Quran 18 : 30-31 says :
>
> > "And say to the believing men and women that they restrain their eyes and guard their private parts. That is purer for them. Surely, Allah is well aware of what they do. And say to the believing women that they restrain their eyes and guard their private parts, and that they do not disclose their natural and artificial beauty except that which is apparent thereof, and that they draw their head-coverings over their bosoms, and that they do not disclose their beauty except to their husbands, or to their fathers, or the fathers of their husbands or their sons or the sons of their husbands or their brothers, or the sons of their sisters, or their women or what their right hands possess ; or such of male attendants who

have no sexual appetite, or young children who have no knowledge of the hidden parts of the women. And they do not strike their feet so that what they hide of the orna-

> ments may become known. And turn to Allah all together, O Muslims, so that you may succeed."

Again, Allah in the Quran 33 : 59 says thus :

> **"O Prophet ! Tell your wives, your daughters and the women of the Muslims that they should draw close to them portion of their loose outcoverings."**

Allah commands the whole mankind to shut all the doors that lead to *zina*. In the Quran 17 : 32, Allah says thus :

> "(O mankind) ! do not come near *zina*, surely, it is a foul thing and an evil way." It opens door to other numerous evils."

9th Candidate. Please allow me to say that Islam recommends severe punishments for *zina*. It commands that an unmarried person who indulges in *zina* should be punished with 100 strips each. The people who are married and are yet guilty of sexual misconduct, they are to be punished by stonning to death. The practice of the Prophet Muhammad (may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him), the Hadith (Sunnah) and the Islamic *Shariat* give the punishment of 100 strips to unmarried offenders. By referring to the Quran 24 : 3,, we find that Allah commands thus :

> "Flog each of *zaniah* (a woman guilty of *zina*) and the *zani* (a man guilty of *zina*) with hundred strips. And let pity do not take hold of you in executing the judgement of Allah, if you believe in Allah and the Last Day. And let a party of the believers witness their punishment. In Islamic *Shariah*, the punishment for the married *zaniah* and *zani*, is stonning to death in a public place. In this case the *Qazi* or *Hakim* (Judge), who passes orders for stonning to death, stones the first stone to the sinner with his own hands."

Group Discussion No. 7

SHOULD MODERN SCIENCE BE CONDEMNED

1st Candidate. Gentlemen ! *Assalam-o-Alaikum*

When a thing proves harmful to man, we have to condemn it. Such is a case with the modern science and the scientists who have brought the world at the verge of destruction. We find that as a result of a thermo-nuclear war, at present, the whole makind is faced

with the serious problem of mass extinction. Although, partial steps have been taken by America, Russia and Britain, etc., to ban nuclear test, yet France, China, etc., are not caring for that. The present

tension between various nations is due to science and the scientists. The main cause of the present armament race is science. All the well-wishers of the mankind including Bertrand Russel had strongly condemned the aggressive nature of modern science and the perverted attitude of the modern scientists towards society. The modern scientists had manufactured atom bombs which brought destruction to Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

2nd Candidate. I also agree to a great extend with my learned friend who was just now condemning the present temper of science and the scientists. The scientists of today are, undoubtedly, playing the part of a "killer" of human race. The Russian and the American scientists are endeavouring to produce cosmic rays for the destruction of human civilization.

3rd Candidate. At present, science is employed more for destructive purposes than for constructive ones. Huge money is spent on the production of armaments, whereas, the same money can be used to remove poverty of the people of the world. Apart from the scientists who prepare destructive arms, the statesmen and politicians are also equally responsible for employing them. We can call these politicians as "political tyrants" and can condemn them too.

4th Candidate. No doubt, the politicians and statesmen are to be blamed, but the main responsibility for preparing the ruinous armaments falls upon the scientists. They should not encourage their political leaders to produce dreadful weapons. The scientists of the world should make a pledge not to produce anything which aims at killing humanity. Their motto should only be to produce "atoms for peace" only. I would like to suggest for the establishment of international brotherhood of scientists which should make certain principles and laws that no scientist of any country, under any circumstances, should produce any weapon that would tend to ruin the world.

Group Discussion No. 8

ARE WE MORE CIVILISED THAN OUR FOREFATHERS ?

1st Candidate. G T O., Sir and friends ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

We are not more civilised than our forefathers. Our forefathers

were far better civilised than us. They were more promoters of Islam than us. Islamic civilisation is the best civilisation and the people who supported it better are, undoubtedly better than us.

2nd Candidate. I disagree with my friend who was just now speaking. There is more Islamic education at present than our forefathers. There are more schools, colleges and universities at present, which impart education to the Muslim masses. There are now more advance presses which print books. There are more learned scholars at present. We have made more progress in every field than our forefathers.

3rd Candidate. I agree with y friend Mr. 2nd Candidate. Apart from making more progress in Islamic education, we have made advancement in vorious fields of science and comforts. These things clearly show that we are more civilised than our ancestors.

4th Candidate. Our forefathers did not make any great advancement. They were naked. They did not cultivate their lands and went hunting for their livelihood. Our technology has developed and now we fly to the moon and are endeavouring to calculate the age of the moon. Our forefathers were often indulging in waging wars against one another, whereas we have established our U.N.O. to settle our international disputes. All these things go to prove that we are, undoubtedly, more civilised than our ancestors.

5th Candidate. Some of my friends have tried to belittle the achievements and the civilisation of our forefathers. Their simple way of living has been described as nakedness. Their spirit of hunting has also been devalued. The just wars which our forefathers fought courageously have also been dishonoured. The value of the worthless U.N.O. has also been mispresented by my friend. The efforts of the present man for tracing the age of the moon is also worthless and is a great damage to the present world economy.

6th Candidate. My able friend Mr. 3rd Candidate has made a mention of the so-called "comforts of the present age". These comforts have brought disturbance in every sphere of the mankind. The luxurious life of the present man has made him lazy and worthless. His life is disturbed. Our forefathers were free of all those worries. They were having more peace of mind.

7th Candidate. My learned friend Mr. 2nd Candidate had described that we are having more Islamic education than our forefathers. Please let me add to your information that day by day the mankind is moving towards ignorance. The world is heading towards a time when the ignorance will be at its zenith and then the world will meet a catastrophe and will end. Thereafter, the Judgment Day will be established by Allah, as a result of which some fortunate people will be allowed to enter *Jannat* (Paradise) by Allah and the rest unfortunate disobedient mankind will be thrown in the *Jahannam* (Hell) by Him.

8th Candidate Just now, when my friend 7th Candidate was speaking, an Islamic view that our forefathers were more civilised than us has struck my mind. Please, let me tell you that there is a hadith, in which the Prophet of the whole mankind, Muhammad (may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) has said, "My age is the best of all ages; then comes the age of my Companions and then comes the age of the followers of the Companions." In the same hadith, the Prophet had stated that as the time will be passing and there will be more distance between him and time, then it will be deteriorating. Considering this fundamental principle of Islam, our forefathers were, undoubtedly, far more civilised than us.

Group Discussion No. 9

Topic :

SCIENCE IS A MENACE TO CIVILIZATION

(*Graduate Course*)

1st candidate : Friends, anybody who attempts an intelligent appraisal of the impact of science on human civilization is bound to reach the conclusion that in the garb of progress, science is threatening not only to destroy our civilization but also to wipe man off the face of the earth. It has no doubt added to the comforts of daily living, but look at the price we have to pay for these small mercies. Everyday we hear of the invention of newer and more efficient engines of destruction which can lay waste whole countries in no time. Thanks to our erstwhile backwardness, man has managed to survive two world-wars in the first half of this century, but in case a third breaks out, science has equipped us with such deadly weapons, that it is bound to end up with the total annihilation of both the victors and the vanquished. The possession of such efficient means of destruction been instrumental in the development of a war psychosis and everyday that passes brings nearer the hour of doom when man will have to pay the price for what little science has been able to do for him, with the great progress it has achieved in working against him. It has undoubtedly proved to be a menace to human civilization.

2nd candidate : I am afraid the indictment of science just pronounced by my friend No. 1 strikes me at one sided and so utterly unconvincing. Can we place the blame squarely on science? Science is knowledge, and knowledge in itself is never bad. It is the application thereof two questionable purposes which is bad ; and for this, man, rather than science is to blame. In the trained and disciplined hands of a surgeon a knife becomes a life saving device, but in the hands of an uncivilised brute, the same knife can become a murderous

tool. Can we say that in the latter case, the knife is to blame ? Similar is the case with science. If the discoveries of science are employed by men for evil purposes, how is science to be blamed ? What menaces civilization is man's quarrel-someness, fear and greed and not ciences. Science is a blessing provided man develops the capacity to derive its full benefits. I, therefore, oppose the motion.

3rd candidate : My friend No. 2 has very able put forward the case for science, and I might have supported his thesis, but I would like to invite the attention of the votaries of scientific and technological advancement to the misery such progress brings in its wake by throwing thousands of artisans and craftsmen out of employment. Increase of production through mechanical efficiency has played havoc with conditions in the labour-market and spread untold misery. This is a direct result of scientific progress out-stripping the needs of society and thus assuming the role of a menace to human civilization. Let us admit that we have not so far been able to integrate science into the requirements of human existence. Society has yet to read just itself to the changes being so rapidly wrought by the science and until this has been done, science will continue to be a menace to civilization.

4th candidate : I agree with what my able friends Mr. No. 1 and Mr. No. 3 have just said. Science, and all progress that it has achieved is gradually leading man to his doom. Rapid scientific advance has been continuously forcing the pace of life so that it has been robbed of all grace. New inventions, backed by the latest techniques of sales-promotion, have brought about an artificial increase in human needs and made a whole generation and greedy. In the breakneck race for material well-being, nobody has the time to stand and stare. Greed has become the primary and the greatest motive force which goads men to ceaseless efforts for acquiring more and more 'good things of life' as they call them. Again it is greed which has driven nations to rise in arms against each other. And what is the result ? In his pursuit of material happiness, man has lost his most precious possession, peace of mind. While he has learnt to pamper his body, he has ignored things of the spirit which give him superiority over other forms of life. In this race for progress, man is fast going downhill. The craze for speed takes a heavy toll of human life not only on the highways, but also increasing the number of suicides and mental cases which is a direct result of the artificial acceleration induced by science in the peace of life. We are, therefore, driven to the inescapable conclusion that science is a menace to human civilization.

5th candidate : Let me say at once that I do not share the unbounded pessimism of my friends who are out to condemn science as an unmitigated civil and a devil which threatens the very existence of civilization. The apprehensions expressed by my friend No. 1 about the approaching doomsday, the concern displayed by my friend No. 3 over the deletarious effects of scientific progress on our social structure and the way my friend No. 4 has bemoaned the faster pace of life leave me unimpressed because there is hardly any basis for such a gloomy view of things. A little deeper thinking will reveal that if there is any-

thing which has deterred man from following his baser and basic war-like instincts, it is the so-called 'engines of destruction'. No world statesman who is sane will accept the responsibility for starting a world-war to-day because science has made the final outcome abundantly clear. If improved methods of production have enabled fewer men to do the same amount of work, it follows that the same number of men can do much more work and produce much more wealth to raise the general standard of living, and with greatly reduced hours of work. In fact, scientific methods, by reducing the drudgery in life give man the chance to devote some time to his spiritual well-being so much in the thoughts of my friend No. 4. He has also referred to deaths on the highways. Why does he forget that it is science which has helped man to conquer epidemics and fell diseases like tuberculosis and cancer. I am doubtful if many here would share his attachment to a static life. Even granted that to-day the risk to life is greater, is this draw-back not more than compensated by the still greater charm which science has bestowed on life. Far from being menace, science is in fact a blessing for civilization for which we cannot be grateful enough.

6th candidate : By now man has, I believe travelled a long way from the days when he regarded lightning as a sign of gods' anger and a comet as a sign of misfortune. In this journey, he has shed quite a load of superstitions and misbeliefs. He now takes pride in calling himself 'civilised.' To those who condemn science, I would put a simple question : How did this process of civilization come about ? There can be no two answers. The only answer is 'through science'. In fact my friends on the opposite side have been confusing science with products of scientific research as available to man. Science is just another name for a spirit of enquiry which is man's best possession. It has so far helped him on the road to progress and will continue to do so in future. Whatever the detractors of science may say, the valuable contribution it has made to civilising man cannot be under-rated. How can we condemn it as a menace to civilization ? It has helped the process of civilization. Whatever has been said to the contrary is based on man's incapacity to make good use of it, and as my friend No. 2 had occasion to point out, the blame for misuse of science has to be laid at the door of man and not at that of science. As somebody has wisely observed, "Science is a good servant but a bad master." If, instead of making science the servant of human progress we have allowed it to feed our hatred and anger, it is our own fault and it does not lie in our mouth to say that science is a menace to civilization.

7th candidate : Friends, if we give deep thought to the proposition before us, we shall find that it betrays some confusion of thought. The great teachers of ancient time employed very rigid methods of screening the applicants who sought admission to their classes. This screening was aimed at preventing undesirable people from gaining access to knowledge, because those great preceptors were convinced that knowledge must be imparted to those only who could be depended upon to put it to good use for the benefit of humanity.

But in the present age, unfortunately, the only criterion for admission to educational institutions remains the capacity to bear the expense. Our system of education does not provide for any screening of aspirants for their intrinsic strength of character. The result is that in general science has become the hand-maiden of people whose nations of social morality are questionable. It is certainly not be fault of science. Hence, I oppose the proposition.

Group Discussion No. 10

Topic :

WAR BRINGS OUT THE BEST IN A NATION

(*Graduate Course*)

1st candidate : Friends ! War has been universally condemned in all ages as an evil, but so far no way has been found to eliminate the possibilities of war. Therefore even though it is an evil, we may, without fear of contradiction, say that it is a necessary evil. And yet, with all the evil that is associated with it, war has its good points as well. The proposition before us today enunciates one such good point. That war brings out the best in a nation is axiomatic.

History is full of numberless instances which go to prove the truth in these words. In order to find such instances, we need not go back to ancient times. Even recent history is replete with them. In the beginning of the Second World War, when Great Britain was left almost alone to face the German might, and was passing through what was perhaps the gloomiest hour in its annals, the imminent danger to their country brought out the best in the islanders. Their cold courage grim determination and supreme defiance of heavy odds was something wonderful and ennobling to behold.

Here in Pakistan we have seen the same phenomenon. The way the whole Pakistan nation rose as one man against the Indian attack in 1965 and 1971 demonstrated that when a nation's freedom, sovereignty or pride is endangered by war, people forget their internal differences and come together to face the danger. No amount of propaganda in favour of national integration could have created that all pervading sense of unity which moved Pakistan during this war. Leaving everything else, this in itself is not a small thing. Unity is the most prized possession a nation can boast of, and its best attribute. War brings it out as nothing else does. I am, therefore, convinced that war brings out the best in a nation.

2nd candidate: My friend Mr. No 1 while admitting that war is an evil, has at the same time paid eloquent tribute to it by supporting the proposition before us today. I am sorry he has not been able to convince me with his argument. Unity in the face of a common danger is but natural, and is not a phenomenon peculiar to war alone. Even natural catastrophes like earthquakes, floods or famines can also galvanise whole nation into united action to relieve distress. Thus, my able friend's choice of national unity brought about by war to illustrate his point appears to have led his argument off at a tangent. And he may not have fallen into the error, had he not set out to defend a weak case. As he has himself agreed, war is an evil, and an unmitigated evil at that—and nothing but evil can result from it. It is a legacy from the days when the world was ruled by brute force. It is bad enough that man has not been able to renounce it even though he claims to have become civilized. But on top of it, to see good in it and to extol its virtues is the limit.

Everyone knows that war is a thing which brutalizes men, ruins the economy of nations and subverts all moral values. It destroys both the victor and the vanquished. It leaves in its wake sorrowful trails of death and destruction bitterness and hatred, and it takes years to repair the damage. Its appeal lies to the baser instincts of man. It clouds the vision, perverts the truth and erodes individual national and international morality. It thus brings out, not the best, but the basest in men and nations alike.

3rd candidate : The impassioned condemnation of war we have just heard from our friend, Mr. No. 2, was impressive indeed ; and I should be dubbed a hawk and a war-monger if I were not to join him in the anti-war sentiments he has so forcefully expressed.

But so far the proposition we are discussing goes, I must say that if Mr. No. 1 went off at a tangent, my able predecessor has completely missed the mark. Instead of saying what war brings out, he has concerned himself with what it imposes. It is no doubt a woe and a calamity which spreads death and destruction. But calamities destroy only the weak. The strong gain further strength fr m them and emerge stronger. A nation pitted in a determined stand against unjust might displays the spiritual grandeur of man in all his glory.

It is in times of war that a nation's hidden reserves of power and capacity to make sacrifices come into play. War brings out a people's capacity for self-sacrifice and makes heroes out of ordinary men and women. It is true nobody wants it, but when it comes, it feeds and inspires the noble sentiment of patriotism as nothing else does. It is the fire which tempers the steel, which purifies the gold but burns down all dirt and dross. It is a fire-test of a nation's strength and undoubtedly brings out the best it holds.

4th candidate : Rather than comparing what war imposes and what it brings out as my friends Mr. No. 2 and Mr. No. 3 have just now done with great ability, I would compare the forces released by war and the impulse provided by peace. If we look at the proposition before us in this way, I am sure there can be no doubt that it is peace and not war that brings out the best in a nation.

War is not the natural state of man. It is a negative condition and induces negative thinking. All the qualities it bring out, e.g.. determination to fight, to suffer hardships, and to sink differences for the time being are negative qualities which, though good in themselves are certainly not the best qualities of a people. The best in men and nations are the creative and constructive urges which, translated into action, take man along the path of progress. It is only in peace that a nation can think of and work for progress. Art and literature which express the best minds of a people can flourish only in peace.

War smothers all the finer instincts and promotes cruelty, vice and stupidity. It has a positively demoralising influence. As such, it is incapable of bringing out the best in a nation which can be possible only in peace-time.

5th candidate : I heartily support the view presented by Mr. No. 4. Wars break out only when nations have lost their ideals and moral standards, and are left with hardly worthwhile which can be brought out.

When a country is engaged in a war, the false glitter of frenzy braggadocio which is let loose in torrents deludes people into mistaking a universal sense of fear in the face of common danger for national unity and desperation as calm determination. The loudest cries for the enemy's blood are generally raised by those who are themselves sitting at a safe distance from the front and relish the thought of others doing the dirty work to preserve their safety. The propaganda machinery of the state does its best and uses various devices to induce mass hysteria among people so that they start behaving like a herd rather than like men. Civil liberties are ruthlessly curbed under cover of an emergency.

These are some of the necessary concomitants of any war fought anywhere in the world. When such are the conditions which wars inevitably create, I fail to understand, how they can bring out the best in nations.

6th candidate : The way my friend, Mr. No. 6, has analysed the psychology of a nation at war is, to say the least, a perversion of truth. In trying to be little national unity and resolve by describing them as the products of mass-frenzy and braggadccio, my friend has, I am afraid, displayed unusual cynicism.

All of us here are of course agreed that war is a bad thing. But just as adversity is man's true touch-stone, battle-fields are the testing grounds of nations. They bring out all that is finest in a people's national character. They not only bring to the surface the sense of unity, the spirit of patriotism, courage and inherent in nations, but also help to discover the peaks of efficiency, inventiveness and discipline of which the combatants are capable.

To say that wars smother creative activity like art and literature is also far from the truth. On the other hand, the numberless deeds of heroism and gallantry performed on the battle-field provide great inspiration to writers and poets, and bring out their best.

I, therefore, endorse the proposition with all the emphasis I command.

Group Discussion No. 11

Topic :

SHOULD MODERN SCIENCE BE CONDEMNED

(*P.M.A. Long Course*)

1st candidate : Gentlemen, I feel ashamed when I am compelled to condemn modern science and modern scientists for having terrorized humanity. Today, the entire mankind faced with the formidably grim problem of mass extinction as a result of a thermo-nuclear war. Although the partial nuclear test-ban treaty has been signed between the Soviet Union, U.S.A. and Britain, the attitude of France and China is pretty alarming.

Science and the scientists are responsible for the tension between a nation and another. The root-cause of the armament race today is science. *Bertrand Russell* and all other great pacifists of the world condemned the aggressively militant temper of modern science and the perverted attitude of modern scientists towards society. As a matter of fact, science which was once considered to be the noblest boon of God to man, has become the worst curse. I cannot but condemn the modern science and modern scientists, especially the scientists who manufactured the atom bombs, which devastated the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

2nd candidate : Gentlemen, to some extent—rather to a great extent—I do agree with my learned friend when he condemns the temper of modern science and the attitude of modern scientists towards war. Recently the scientists of East and West are warned against playing the role of "a murderer—a mass-murderer of human race" !

The fact is that detached from spiritual and ethical code, science has taken up an aggressive role. Modern scientists have been converted into mass murderers. Why do they manufacture megaton, hydrogen bombs, when they know that these bombs would destroy entire human civilization ?

The U.S. and the Russian scientists, you know very well, are engaged in the production of cosmic rays for the destruction of mankind. What a pity !

Gentlemen, I would have certainly condemned scientists and science itself out-right, had science not given us certain creative and constructive things like X-ray, Penicillin, Radium etc.

3rd candidate : Gentlemen, indeed, today science is being harnessed more for destructive purpuses than for constructive and creative ones. Hundreds of billions of dollars are being spent on armament-production, when with the same amount poverty of the entire world can be removed and there would be no hungry or ill-fed or ill-clothed or unsheltered on this earth. It is pity that atomic energy, which is the greatest and most creative of the powers of Nature, is being used for killing hundreds of millions of human beings in one second.

But the question is how far we should put the blame on scientists alone. I think modern politicians and statesmen too are equally responsible for the gross prostitution of science that we witness today. And I think these bald-headed politicans and statesmen are to be condemned. Scientists are being treated at prisoners by these political bosses—rather I would call them 'political tyrants' no less condemnable than the great tyrant, Nero, who got Rome burnt while he was playing upon his fiddle !

4th candidate : Gentlemen, I quite agree with my worthy friend that our modern statesmen and politicians should be blamed for making prostitution of science. But at the same time, a good deal can be said against -our modern scientists. Why do they encourage their political bosses to produce weapons of mass-destruction by making latest inventions of these dreadful weapons ? The scientists, all over the world, should make it a pledge of honour that, come what may, they would not produce anything which tends to slaughter humanity. They should take a solemn vow unanimously that they would harness the potentiality of atom only for peaceful purpose. "Atoms for Peace only"—should be their motto.

But, it is a matter of sheer pity that modern scientists, especially of Western countries and Russia, have developed a tendency to produce far more destructive weapons of science than what they already possess. Why do they inform their political bosses of the destructive potentiality of science ? They should harness constructive and creative power of science. With atomic energy they can change the face of our earth. They can change the African deserts and all other deserts of the world into smilling orchards and fields, producing so much food that the entire mankind can be fed and the question of food-shortage be solved once and for all. Unless our modern scientists develops this humanitarian outlook, we must censure their present attitude, if we don't condemn them outright.

5th candidate : Gentlemen, I agree with my worthy friend who spoke just now. Modern politicians and statesmen, who have become too much power intoxicated, should be condemned for doing prostitution of science. And at the same time, as my friend has just pointed out, scientists, too, are to be censured—if not condemned—for helping these war-mongers, *i.e.*, our modern statesmen and diplomats. Why should they manufacture weapons of mass-destruction of humanity when they with their scientific genius, can create a paradise of eternal bliss on this earth ?

But we should not condemn science. Science is the noblest boon that God has conferred upon us. Science has a highly significant and didactic mission. Its ultimate aim is to make man realize his maker

—God—which according to science, is the greatest truth. We ourselves, are to be blamed and condemned for making perverted use of science. If a thermo-nuclear war devastates the world, we shall be held responsible for it and not science.

Gentlemen, I would suggest the establishment of international brotherhood of scientists which should make certain laws and principles for all the scientists of the world—that no scientist of any country, under any circumstances, should undertake production of any weapon that tends to destroy the world. And let such an association of world scientists offer constructive aid to the United Nations in the establishment of Globial harmony and world peace.

Group Discussion No. 12

SHOULD WOMEN HAVE COMPLETE EQUALITY WITH MEN ?

1st Candidate. Gentlemen ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

The Christian world allots the woman a title of "better half". Then, why we should not be prepared to give her at least complete equality with man ? The "better half" enjoys more concessions in the Western world and is helping in the advancement of those nations. If the status of equality is granted to the remaining women, then there will be great progress in the whole world. Therefore, the earlier we allow equal status to women, the better it is.

2nd Candidate. Allah has created men and women as equal partners and not as subordinates. There is a famous saying from Simon de Beauvon which remarks "One is not born but rather becomes a woman". Woman's equality of status with man will enable a woman to work for the welfare of the nation in a much better way. And it will raise the nation to a better standard of the nations in the world.

3rd Candidate. My two speaker friends have tried their best to place our women on an equal status with our men for the progress of our country. No one can have any objection to their views if a country could make progress in that way. My learned brother Mr. 1st Candidate has quoted a saying of the Christian people that "A woman is the better half of a man." It is only a lip service of the Western people to their poor women. But in actual practice, the women of the West are totally debarred from all kinds of property rights. In the Christian inheritance law, all the property rights of a

man are transferred to his eldest son. The poor women have to work in offices and factories for their living. This brings disturbance both in the lives of the Western men and the women. The wörking of the women with the men does not bring any advancement to the nation but it works as a retardation. We see that the greatest supporter of equality of women was "Great Britain" which has been reduced to

'Little Britain" and it is still liquidating and is going to give birth to a "free Ireland".

4th Candidate. Please allow me to refer to the remarks of my friend Mr. 2nd Candidate who says that "Allah has created men and women as equal partners and not as subordinates." He has uttered these words without any authority. No religion or ideology supports his view. Allah has created mankind in two distinct categories of men and women. There is a contrast difference in their bodily features and shapes. There is a contrast difference in the shape of their minds. There is a contrast in their habits. There is a contrast in their works and duties. There is also a clear contrast in their thinking. There is a vivid contrast in the courage of a man and a woman. There is not a single woman in the world who can walk alone in a jungle, at night, whereas it is very easy for a man. On account of the cowardness of the woman-folk, there is no instance in history where the women have been recruited as soldiers. Again, there is no women who can wrestle with a man. The thinking of the woman-folk is also not mature and it is far inferior to man. The spirit of endurance in women is also very weak. In their habits and weakness of their aim, the woman mostly resemble children. The spirit of nursing their children is very great in the women. Thus, we find that there is a vivid contrast between a man and a woman in both her physical and mental powers as compared with a man. In all this there is a great wisdom of Allah. He is the Creator, Nourisher and Administrator of all things. He has allotted different duties to man and woman for their success both in this temporary world and the everlasting Hereafter. Now, when Allah has not placed a woman on an equal status with man, then how can we place this weak creation on an equal footing with man ?

5th Candidate. If we commit the folly of placing a woman on an equal status with a man, then unpleasant disputes will ensue in the society. There will be unending disputes between the husbnnd and his wife, between brother and his sister, etc.

6th Candidate. .Women's equal status with men will enable the women to neglect their children who are great assets of our nation. This process will ruin our nation.

7th Candidate. The European women have been given some rights. We often see that their husbands are carrying placards in cities protesting against the behaviou of their wives. There are numerous separate unions of both husbands and wives who complain against the behaviour of each other. The family quarrels have multiplied there. The women do not attend to their children and do

not prepare food at homes. They attend clubs. This system has totally spoiled the family life in those countries. This has resulted in ruining the happiness of the mankind.

8th Candidate Please allow me to advance still another sound reason which will show that women cannot be given complete equality with men. This reason is again deduced from the natural religion of the whole mankind for all times—Islam. We find that whereas Allah gives share of a property to a woman, He asserts that men are superior to women. Referring to the Quran (4 : 34). We find that Allah says :

> "Men are guardians over women, because Allah has made some of them excell others, and because they (men) spend of their wealth. So virtuous women are those who are obedient, and guard with Allah's protection. And as for those on whose part you fear disobedience, admonish them and leave them alone in their beds, and beat them. Then if they obey you, then do not seek a way against them. Surely, Allah is High, Great."

Group Discussion No 13

WHAT QUALITY IN A WIFE IS PREFFRABLE—BEAUTY, WEALTH OR CHARACTER

1st Candidate. Gentlemen ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum*.

There is a famous proverb which says "A thing of beauty is a joy for ever". So a beautiful wife is a joy for ever. A beautiful wife brings happiness to her husband.

2nd Candidate. A wife without beauty is like a flower of the desert. She has got little attraction from her husband.

3rd Candidate. A beautiful wife lessens the family disputes. It results in living camly.

4th Candidate. If the wife is not beautiful, then her wealth and character has got no great value. Beauty is very essential for a wife. It helps in spending a happy life.

5th Candidate. A beautiful wife also lessens house expenditure. She will spend less money on costly clothes and cosmetics on account of her natural beauty. This also lessens financial worries of family life.

6th Candidate It is quite possible that a beautiful wife might also possess wealth and character. Thus, the family life may be most successful.

7th Candidate. Wealth has always commanded a great value in the world. In the present world it has also attained more value. A wife which has got wealth has got great respect. She brings relief to her husband, her children and the whole family. A wealthy wife helps in leading a happy life for her husband and her other family.

8th Candidate. Financial troubles cause family disputes. Beauty cannot solve them, whereas wealth can solve them easily. So a wealthy wife is far better than a beautiful wife.

9th Candidate. Beauty becomes the basis of numerous disputes, whereas wealth solves many disputes. Therefore, a wealthy wife is far better than a beautiful wife.

10th Candidate. Wealth can buy happiness. A wealthy wife can be helpful in buying some other property or some concern of business or industry which can bring income and make family life happy. Beauty is not helpful in bringing any income to a family or a husband.

11th Candidate. As compared to beauty and wealth, character of a wife commands the utmost value. Islam lays great stress on the character of both man and woman.

At one place the Quran says : "Pious wives are meant for pious husbands and characterless wives are meant for characterless husbands." A characferless wife is liable to stonning to death.

12th Candidate. A wife without character is like a wolf. She will bring dishonour to her husband, her children, her parents, and others relatives. She is very dangerous to her relatives and the society. She is a failure both in this world and the next world.

13th Candidate. Lack of character of a wife invites unending disputes and quarrels in the family. This brings a number of worries to her own husband and her other relatives and family members. A characterless wife makes a home, a hell on earth.

14th Candidate. Good character is the foremost thing for a wife whereas wealth and beauty are secondary things. Without character everything is worthless.

15th Candidate. It is only good character of a wife which can create an atmosphere of real love and happiness in family life. The most essential ornament for a wife is her good character. It makes the life of a family successful both in this world and the Hereafter.

Group Discussion No 14

BASIC EDUCATION

1st Candidate. Gentlemen ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum*.

Basic education is very essential for a nation. It has been recommended by great men such as Sir Syed Ahmad Khan ; Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, etc.

2nd Candidate. The English system of education has got many obvious shortcomings. Being a foreign language, it did not receive any attraction from the Muslims who are well acquainted with Arabic, Persinan, Urdu, etc.

3rd Candidate. The Government has co-operated to uplift basic education for educational reconstruction.

4th Candidate. The basic education is very helpful for removing the un-employment. This is a great service to the nation. It reduces poverty.

5th Candidate. The basic education is not helpful for a nation which is advancing. Therefore, it does not serve its purpose.

6th Candidate. The basic education is a hinderance in the way of training boys for specialisation in the subjects other than technical.

7th Candidate. Basic education will only help to lessen un-employment in the lower class of society and not in the higher one.

Group Discussion No. 15

WHO INFLUENCES THE BOY MOST - PARENTS, FRIENDS OR TEACHERS ?

1st Candidate Gentlemen ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum*.

The parents are the real source of love and fear for their boys. The parents know when to love and when to use some harshness upon their boys. This helps in physical and mental development of boys. A boy gains his health and spiritual power under the afectionate love of his parents.

2nd Candidate. A boy learns much by imitating his parents. Therefore, it is essential on the part of the parents that they should develop the Islamic values in them. The parents of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan,

Ismail *Shaheed*, Shah Wali Ullah, *Mujaddad Alfsani*, Maulana Abul Aa'la Maudoodi, Al-Qadhafi, Iqbal, Hali, etc., had all Islamic-minded parents.

3rd Candidate. There are numerous instances which show that the boys who get their education by residing in boarding houses go useless. There is lack of parental care in these hostels and their good habits are not developed. Some of these boys who are not matured in wisdom are spoiled.

4th Candidate. The research has discovered that the cause for juvenile delinquency is on account of absence of parental care and control.

5th Candidate. Friends are also very dear to a boy. More than half of his time is passed in the company of his friends. He plays with them. He adopts their manners.

6th Candidate. A boy learns more from his friends than anyone else. The other boys are his equals and he feels very free with them. There is no better way for learning things from friends than others because it is very easy for him to approach them.

7th Candidate. If the friends of a boy are good, then he learns good things from them. If his friends have got good habits, then the boy will also adopt good habits, and if his friends are spoiled, then this boy will also be spoiled. It is the company of the boy that speakes of his character. A boy of good friends will be successful in his studies, whereas a boy of bad company will be a failure in his studies.

8th Candidate. It is the competitive spirit of a boy with his friends that paves his way for success in his life. If the friends of a boy are honest, hard-working and simple, then they will also lead the boy to laborious work. The good boys will ask their friends to offer regular prayers. They will ask their friends to obey their parents, teachers and elders. It is the company that makes or spoils a boy.

9th Candidate. A boy learns much from his teachers. Most of the time of a boy is spent in schools and colleges in the company of his teachers. The teachers are learned and matured people and they try their best to teach the young boys as they think that they will be the makers of the nation of tomorrow.

10th Candidate. A good teacher enables a boy to lead a successful life both in this world and the Hereafter. Most of the teachers are in the spirit of building a young nation. They endeavour to make their pupils as able and learned as possible. Most of teachers work with the spirit that pupils in their later lives will raise their name to honour. And often it has been witnessed as true.

11th Candidate. When we compare as to who is the person among parents, friends and teachers who influence the boy most, then we find that these are parents of the boys. From the very time of birth of the boys till their death, it is their parents, if they happen to

survive, who keep on guiding them with affectionate manners. The parents guide the boys in their educaional period, in their service or business period, in their marriage period and afterwards too. The parents of boys accompany them through thick and thin. The young boys are always astraying from the right path of Islam and their parents are always in the effort to place them again on the right path. The parents have to bear all the responsibilities of their boys to their old age. Allah has placed this responsibility upon them and being mature, the parents try to do it as best as they could. Islam places a

great responsibility upon the parents for their children. Allah commands the parents to be affectionate to their children both in the Quran and the Hadith. The Quran commands the parents to be very forgiving to their children. Whenever Satan misguides the children, their parents come to their help and place them again on the path of Islam. Throughout their lives the parents always show forgiveness to their offspring.

12th Candidate. The Quran and the Hadith also commands the children to obey their parents. In the Quran 17 : 23-24, 4 : 36, 6 : 151, Allah commands the children to obey their parents in these words :

"Your *Rabb* has commanded : Worship nobody but Him, and show kindness to your parents. If one of them or both of them attain old age with you, never say to them any word expressive of disgust nor reproach them, but address them with excellent speech, and lower to them the wing of humility out of tenderness, and say : My *Rabb* have mercy on them even as they nourished me in my childhood".

"And worship Allah and do not associate anything with Him and show kindness to parents, and relatives and orphans, and the needy, and to the neighbour that is a kinsman and the neighbour that is a stranger, and the companion by your side, and the wayfarer and those whom your right hands possess. Surely, Allah does not love the proud and the boastful".

"Say, come, I will rehearse to you what your *Rabb* has forbidden : that you must not associate anything as partner with Him and that you do good to parents, and that you do not kill your children for fear of poverty it is We Who provide for you and for them – and that you do not come near foul deeds, whether open or secret : and that you do not kill the life which Allah has made sacred, except by right. That is what, He has enjoined upon you, so that you may undertsand".

13th Candidate. My learned friends have described very interesting Islamic values in respect of rights of both children and parents. As there is a great importance for the respect of the parents on the part of their children, therefore, I must also contribute something for my friends.

There is a hadith from Abdullah bin Umar which says that the Prophet Muhammad (may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) has said : "The pleasure of *Rabb* is in the pleasure of the father and

the rage of *Rabb* is in the rage of the father". There is another hadith which says "Father is the best gate to *Jannat* by obeying him". The mother deserves more respect from children than their father. Her rank is three-fold than father. There is a hadith from Abu Bakrah which says that there is no sin to be punished in this world except disobedience and a person who disconnects himself from his relatives. Ibn-e-Umar says that he has heard that the Prophet

ay Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) used to say that a [illegible] who speaks of favours conferred, a person who disobeys his or [illegible] arents and a person who drinks wine, will not enter *Jannat*. A pe n came to the Prophet and told him that his parents had died, what good thing he could do for them. The Prophet answered that he should seek favour for them from Allah and he should seek forgiveness from Allah for them. A person should complete those things for which his parents had promised and he should pay respect to those relatives to whom their parents had been paying respect. When Halimah came to the Prophet, he spread his cloth for her to sit on, because she has brought him up upon her milk. A man came to the Prophet and sought permission for joining a *Jehad* campaign. The Prophet enquired from the man if his mother was alive. He answered in positive. Thereupon, the Prophet commanded him to go back and serve her mother as *Jannat* lays under her feet. This command of the Prophet shows that the service of the mother is better than *Jehad* and the *Jannat* has been described to be situated underneath her feet. Abdullah bin Umar (may Allah be pleased with him) divorced his wife on the order of his father Umar (may Allah be pleased with him). This brings the importance of the order of the father for a son. A man asked the Prophet as to what are the rights of parents upon their children ? He said that they are your *Jannat* and *Jahannam* (Hell).

There is another hadith which reads thus :

"A person who spends a night in obeying Allah and his parents, then the doors of *Jannat* are opened for him. In a similar way, if a person spends his night in disobeying his Allah and his parents, then the doors of the Hell are opened for him. And if he disobeys his mother or father, then a door of the Hell is opened for him". A person asked from the Prophet that should children also obey their parents even if they show aggressiveness upon them ? Thereupon, the Prophet said "Yes". And the Prophet repeated this thing thrice. There is also another hadith which says that if a son once looks upon his parents with kindness, then Allah allows credit of a *Haj* for him. If a son wins the credit of seeing his parents with kindness for a hundred times, then imagine how much credit there is for him with his Allah ?

— —

Group Discussion No. 16

Topic :

HAS U.N.O. SERVED ANY CONCRETE PURPOSE

(*P.M.A. Education Corps*)

1st candidate : Gentlemen, Prior to hitting upon the cream of the topic, concerned, let me remind you of late Mr. Kennedy's words, which he used, while addressing the 18th session of the U N. General Assembly : "Let us build up the U N. as a peace-keeping and peace-fostering organization and as a means for providing aid to developing countries."

It should be noted carefully that today the U.N.O. has a membership of 130 sovereign countries of the world. It is entirely wrong to suggest that the United Nations is a farce and that it has not been able to do anything concretely genuine for the cause of world peace. Again I challenge, rather pretty emphatically, the view that the United Nations Organization has miserably failed in its cherished mission—*i.e.*, of maintaining world peace and world order. The U.N.O. has endeavoured its best to do the needful humanity, and in so many spheres it has attained glimmering success, for example, in the case of Congo, Korea, Viet Nam, West Irian and in the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia. Of course, the United Nations Organization has not been able to tackle some of the outstanding problems of the world like those of Berlin, Laos, South Viet Nam, Arab Israel conflict, Indo-Pakistan conflict, Kashmir issue etc. But the most redeeming aspect of optimism has been the signing of the East-West partial nuclear test-ban treaty.

2nd candidate : Gentlemen, with due apology to my friend who spoke first, I would like to point out the glaring fact rather the most unpleasant fact, which my friend failed to touch upon while expressing his views on the efficacy of the world Forum, known as the United Nations.

In my opinion, the U.N.O., like its predecessor, the League of Nations, has been more a farce than a reality. It has not served any of the missions for which it was brought into being after the collapse of the League of Nations. May I ask what it has done in connection with the Indo-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir ? Again, may I ask what the U N. has done to solve East Pakistan Crisis ? Again, may I ask what the U.N. has done to solve the 21-year-old Berlin Problem ? It is due to this issue that the entire continent of Europe has been made a battle-field for the last 21 years. It is due to this problem, and only this problem, that the world has been tormented by the fear

of cold war. What has the U.N. done in solving the greatest problem or our age—*i.e.*, of complete and general disarmament ? The Moscow partial nuclear test-ban pact has indeed been signed, but it does not and *shall not* stop nuclear-testing, especially the underground nuclear tests. Disarmament conferences have been "a much ado about nothing" Complexity of world situation has gone from bad to worse. The United Nations Organisation has been really a farce.

3rd candidate : Gentlemen, I am also concurrent with my friend who spoke just now and my views are almost identical with those of my friend, especially on the point that the U.N.O. has failed—and failed miserably to transform its ideal practice. It has not been able to offer any relief to the nuclear-war-terrorized world. The U.N.O., as a matter of fact, has been more or less an arena where mental gymnastics of the two rival Power blocs have been witnessed, I am with my learned friend, *i.e.*, speaker No. 2, when he opines that the U.N.O has been nothing but a bundle of self-contradictions. It has nothing absolutely to call original, genuine or realistic. It is the same old institution, *i.e.*, the League of Nations which had been defrauding man for a number of years and at last brought about the Second World War.

I would certainly say that the U.N.O. is simply a symbol, having no realistic and concrete mission ; I am afraid I may not be forced to described it as a 'farce' as my friend has just now described it.

4th candidate : Gentlemen, I have watched the speeches of the last two debators and also reflected upon their arguments, which they displayed. But I regret that both of them had been sentimentally buttressed and that both took up a perverted dogmatic line in their argument. To say that the 27-years U.N.O. with a total membership of 130 nations, is simply a farce is something like self-negation or self-betrayal. Again I challenge, fairly boldly, their remark that U.N O. is dead. I would say-rather shout loudly and at the top of my voice—the United Nations is as vital and significant as any other institution on the earth can be.

My learned friends said that the U.N.O. has not performed any useful accomplishment in maintaining world peace. May I remind them the splendidly glorious work which it had done in the Congo ? Has it not solved the problem of West Irian, which otherwise might have caused a war between Indonesia and the Netherlands ? Has it not solved the Paleistine problem? Did not the ex-U.N. Secretary General U Thant, intervened in the Cuban missile episode which was going to envelop the world with a full-fledged nuclear war ? And it will not be out of place if I say that the Moscow East-West partial test-ban treaty is a document of history originated from the efforts of the United Nations. Gentlemen, how can one say, then that the U.N O. is simply a symbol or a farce ?

5th candidate : Gentlemen, I do not entirely agree with my learned friend who has just furnished his arguments in favour of the effec-

tiveness and efficacy of the United Nations Organization as a world-forum for maintaining world peace. My friend has been over optimistic in his estimate about the U.N.O. and its accomplishments or achievements.

Indeed, in the Congo the U.N.O. did splendidly, especially in its military operation against the reactionary elements of Katanga. But you must know that the Congo is a small country and it has no military power like that of Russia, China, or the United States. It is very easy to deal with a weak and military impotent country like Congo or Israel, but can the U.N.O. deal with a similar problem with the Soviet Union U.S A, or China ?

In order to be effective in its decision and operation the United Nations must maintain a powerful and strong force at its disposal. Moreover it must also have an accord for unanimity among its members. The two powerful member-blocs, the United States and U.S.S.R, are not at all co-operation with the United Nations and the organization is too weak to censure either of these two powers.

6th candidate : Gentlemen, I would like to use the historic quotation from the writings of *Joseph Addison i e*, "much can be said on both sides." The United Nations has its two account-sheets of debit and credit, as regards its achievements and failures. But I shall be the last man to form a pessimistic view about the future of this world-forum—the beacon of hope for frustrated and war-terrorized humanity today.

Particularly with the heavier weight of non-aligned states, which have recently joined its membership, the United Nations has evolved a new out-look. Out of its total ! membership of 130, 57 are from non-eligned Afro-Asian countries. So the voting weight at the U.N O. is with these non-aligned countries. The Anglo-American or NATO bloc and the Soviet bloc are numerically inferior to the non-aligned bloc. With the accumulation of majority of votes by the non-aligned nations the picture of U.N.O. has undergone a radical change.

Gentlemen, the United Nations is the only hope of peace and peaceful co-existence in the world. We should never even imagine its decay. May the U.N.O. live long !

Group Discussion No. 17

Topic :

NUCLEAR WEAPONS MUST BE BANNED

(P.M A. Engineering Corps)

1st candidate : Friends, I support the proposition which has been put before us. Everyday, we read in the newspapers about the pollution of the atmosphere by atomic fall-out from the devices exploded by unscrupulous war-mongers. Whole regions are contaminated. Everyone knows how dangerous this can be for health and among those effected are innocent people who are made to suffer for no fault of theirs. Nuclear devices not only disturb the composition of the atmosphere, but also interfere with the structure of the earth and spread diseases about many of which we know nothing so far. In fact, nuclear weapons are not weapons of war in the accepted sense of the term. They are diabolical engines of death and destruction. It is not possible to use them with discretion because, along with the objective against which they are directed, they destroy much more than may suffice for purposes of war. There can be no justification for the use, and therefore, the manufacture of such weapons and I forcefully plead that they must be banned altogether.

2nd candidate : The arguments advanced by my friend, Mr. No. 1 echo the views expressed by detractors of gun-powder when it was first used and in more recent times by those who felt mortified at the supposed danger to public health from gas-fumes given out by the horseless carriage. In spite of the concern expressed by such well-meaning critics of those inventions, neither gun-powder nor the motor car were banned. The hazards, if there were any, have been removed with the help of improved manufacturing techniques and in other ways. Nuclear technologists are already engaged in the task of manufacturing a clean bomb to minimise the hazards of radiation ; and it may not long before they succeed in their efforts. It is in this direction that efforts should be concentrated rather than banning nuclear weapons altogether because, in the present political climate of the world, they serve as useful deterrents to the ambitions of states and their leaders. I, therefore, oppose the motion.

3rd candidate : I endorse the views expressed by my friend, Mr. No. 2. Those who support the proposition perhaps do not realize that had it not been for the exsistence of nuclear weapons, we might still have been in the midst of the second great war, being carried on by the eastwhile allies. Humanity was rescued from the night-mare by President Harry S. Truman's courageous decision to put the A-bomb to use and ever since, we have seen how the fear of nuclear weapons

being pressed into service has served to localise international conflicts which, in the absence of nuclear deterrents, could well have become the starting point for a Third World War. It has happened in Korea, in Berlin and in Cuba. In case the efforts of those who are out to ban these weapons are successful, the world will be left to the tender mercies of petulant war-lords whom nothing but a possible nuclear holocaust is keeping in check. I have, therefore to submit that the proposition before us is unsound and the motion must fall.

4th candidate : Only recently, the world observed the twentieth anniversary of the most shameful event in the annals of man in the destruction of two cities of Japan with the first atom bombs used on this earth. The people who have been through the experience are still suffering from its ill-effects. I am surprised to find that even then, some of us have the heart to say that nuclear weapons should continue to be manufactured. They plead that the existence of such weapons acts as a deterrent against war-like tendencies. In other words, they mean to say that the fear of total destruction only prevents mankind from being engulfed in another world-war. If this is so, it is indeed a sad commentary on our civilization. In case we are civilized in the real sense, we must have more respect for life and seek to establish peace on earth by promoting the ideal of universal brotherhood of mankind. But this is hardly possible until we muster courage enough to banish all kinds of fear from our hearts and discard all weapons of destruction, particularly the nuclear variety. I, therefore, support the proposition.

5th candidate : With due apologies to my friend, Mr. 4, I wish to say that it is all very well to talk of 'respect for life' and 'the ideal of universal brotherhood' but realities are very much different. The idea of banning nuclear weapons was born along with the first such weapon which was manufactured. All leading statesmen of the world have at one time or the other supported it, but in practice, they have not been able to achieve agreement over an elementary issue like the inspection of nuclear installations. The 17-nation Geneva Disarmament Conference has been plagued by deadlocks from the very outset. What is the reason ? It is only this that in international affairs mutual trust simply does not exist. A majority of the speeches made at the forums convened to find ways and means of banning nuclear weapons are no more than tongue in cheek performances. The ideal embodied in the proposition put to us today is no doubt very laudable, but in the prevailing climate of fear and distrust, it would be wholly absurd and thoroughly unrealistic to imagine that such measures can succeed. So many attempts in this direction have already failed, and no new factor has come into play to reverse the trend. I, therefore, oppose the proposition.

6th candidate : The refrain of the arguments advanced by my friend, Mr. No. 5, in support of his thesis is that all previous attempts to ban nuclear weapons have failed and that, therefore, no further attempt need be made. Does my friend mean to suggest that this is reason enough for humanity to give way to despair ? That would

be, to say the least, a defeatist, attitude, or, to put it more mildly, an escapist attitude. I am all in favour of continuing the efforts to ban nuclear weapons, and while supporting the proposition, I would like to invite your attention to the great economic strain that the manufacture of atomic weapons put on a country's industrial and financial resources If all the money that is spent on the fashioning of nuclear weapons with higher and higher destructive potential is utilized to fight poverty and disease, it will surely go a long way to eliminate causes of international conflicts and tensions. The manufacture of nuclear weapons is a very telling example of the misuse of science by man. Atamic energy is a giant, which, if employed for peaceful purposes, can create immense benefits for mankind. But, unfortunately, the most powerful nations of the world are giving priority to war research which can bring nothing but destruction in its wake. It is, therefore, very necessary that the mad race is stopped at once and a complete ban on the manufacture and use of atomic weapons is enforced without delay.

7th candidate : Starting from the sling and the club, throughout known history, man has been busy fashioning better and more efficient weapons according as his requirements of offence and defence have been changing with the changing social structure. And he will continue to do so till he can completely master his basic fighting instincts. But that will be achieved, not by banning weapons, conventional or nuclear, but by changing the moral and ethical values which he cherishes. Till such time as that can be done, he will need weapons. The age of the sling and the arrow is past, and we are living in the nuclear era now. As all of us know, the development of nuclear weapons was not a mere accident. Man was obliged to go after them with all possible speed in order to shorten the duration of the last world war which had been taking a heavy toll of lives for more than six years But his efforts have been well-rewarded. Besides achieving the desired purpose, he has discovered the means of shortening likely future conflicts. The development of nuclear weapons has outdated long-drawn-out ordeals the like of which have been witnessed at least twice during the present century. It has also eliminated the chances of war breaking out on flimsy pretexts. Today more than ever, the leaders of all countries realize that to start a war in the present times means accepting a very heavy responsibility, because of the existence of weapons which can lay whole countries waste in a matter of second. Nobody is prepared to take that risk with the result that trend in favour of negotiations to settle international disputes is gaining strength. A ban on nuclear weapons at this stage can serve only to reverse the trend. I, therefore, oppose the proposition.

Group Discussion No. 18

Topic .

THE U.N.O. HAS FAILED AND MUST BE WOUND UP

(*Short Service Commission*)

1st candidate : Friends ! Judging from its performance over the last two decades the only conclusion we can reach is that the future of the U.N.O. is bleak indeed. The Organization had been formed for the maintenance of international peace and security. But has its existence in any way promoted these ideals ? Has it been able to achieve its objectives in any measure ? In spite of its being there, the number of regional military alliances has increased in the post-war world. NATO, CENTO, SEATO, the Warsaw Pact and so many other alignments of mutually hostile force have come into being. Its decisions on such questions as Palestine and South West Africa have been honoured more in their violations by the states concerned. It was completely by passed in settling really important questions like Berlin and Cuba. It has not been able to make the countries of the world agree to either disarmament or non-prolifera-tion of nuclear weapons. What it has been able to achieve is stop-gap cease-fires which are even more dangerous than the problems they are supposed to have solved. Looking to all this, I feel convinced that the world body stands doomed and must be dissolved.

2nd candidate : My friend Mr. No. 1 has just now listed some failures of the U.N.O. As all of you must have noticed, he has gone beyond the political sphere in his denunciation of the world body. I have to submit that we are too much obsessed with politics and are prone to judge everything from the political angle. Our concern with politics must not, however, be allowed to blind us the useful work done by the U.N.O. in other spheres of international co-operation *e.g.*, Health, World Economy, Agriculture, Education, Labour, control of dangerous drugs etc. The U.N.O. has done considerable good work in these spheres and it is neither proper nor just to simply write it off because it has not yet achieved any spectacular successes in the political field. It is enough that the nations of the world have learnt to sit together and discuss matters for the general good. I would, therefore, not join the prophets of doom who foresee nothing but a bleak future ahead. The U.N.O. is a useful organization and a step towards the establishment of a world order. Its foundations have already been securely laid and, occasional crises notwithstanding, it is bound to emerge as the greatest benefactor of mankind in course of time.

3rd candidate : My friend, Mr. No. 2 has rightly praised the good work being done by the various agencies set up by the U.N.O. to promote international co-operation. That such international regulation of matters concerning mankind in general is a good thing cannot be denied, but in trying to bypass the complete failure of the U.N.O. on the political front, he forgets that political stability is the *sine qua non* for all social progress, and that is what the world body has not been able to achieve. It is, therefore, apparent that the U.N.O. is going the way of the League of Nations, and its political collapse is sure to be followed by the winding up of its various social agencies.

I shall not deny that sincere and strenuous efforts have been made to lead the world along the path of peace, but facts are facts and the truth of what my friend No. 1 has said cannot be denied either. In my opinion, as long as the member countries are not willing to subordinate their sovereignty and to recognise that the declared purposes cannot be achieved except by conceding some over riding rights to an international organization committed to bringing about world peace, the existence of the U.N.O. is pointless. Because there is no hope of this coming about, I agree with the proposition before us.

4th candidate : Friends, the proposition before us today strikes me as a cry frustration. My friends, Mr. No. 1 and Mr. No. 3 have recounted the failures of U.N.O. as also tried to give reasons why it is doomed. Are we to accept that the vast undone should be ignored because not enough has been done ? I shall concede that the U.N.O. has not been able to achieve world peace within its life of 27 years but that is hardly enough reason why it should be wound up. It may take another 20 years, or may be 200 years, but mankind will ignore the goal of bringing about international peace by all possible means and by constant striving only at its own perill. The very fact that the need of establishing an organization like the U.N.O. was felt, was a hopeful sign. That disagreement between countries presists but can be openly discussed in this forum, also signifies progress from the era of secret diplomacy and clandestine alignment of forces. The open diplomacy and the widely publicised international debates which are carried on in the chambers of the U.N.O. further strengthen the hope that all is not lost yet. Even now the nations of the world can act in unison on the basis of whatever measure of agreement they can ultimately achieve after discussions. The cease-fire enforced by the U.N.O. could not have been brought about without the concurrence of a majority of its members and these have, through the last 20 years, been saving the world from a possible nuclear catastrophe. I do not agree that the U.N.O. has failed and must be wound up. If nothing else, man's instinct for self-preservation is enough to ensure that the organization will continue to function and will eventually succeed in its mission.

5th candidate : I would appeal for a little more sense of realism in this discussion. Let us try to see things as they are. It is a hard fact that today we find the nations divided into at least four mutually

distrustful groups *viz.*, a Western group led by the U.S.A. an Eastern group led by the Soviet Union, a dissident group led by China and a conglomeration of nations calling themselves unaligned. All these groups are working at cross-purposes and by this time they have been able to undermine existence of the United Nations Organization to such an extent that its future appears really doubtful. It has become impossible for the world body to take a straight decision on any issue brought before it because the discussion is invariably vitiated by group politics. When the organization came into being, many deluded themselves in the belief that it will act as a guardian of international morality and ensure justice as between nation and nation. The myth was, however exploded very soon by the manner in which the U.N.O. handled Kashmir and Korea. It was proved beyond any shadow of doubt that Lake Success was no more than an arena for prize-cock-fighting on the part of various groups, and that there was not necessarily to be any relation between the merits of a case and the decision reached on it by the U.N.O. In the presence of such diehard alignments, it cannot be said that all members of the organization have a common purpose before them. In the recent dispute over the peace-keeping dues, we were treated to the spectacle of a paralysed U.N.O. gasping for breath under the weight of powerful rivals, trying to get at each other's throat. As it is constituted at present, any member, especially among those who appropriated to themselves the grossly undemocratic right of veto from the outset, can hold the organization to ransom and smother it out of existence. When it has patently failed to become the means of ensuring international justice, and is obviously at the mercy of leaders of the super powers, I do not see how it can be said that it will yet survive and fulfil its destiny. To my mind, it has out-lived its utility and is already well set on its way to self-extinction.

6th candidate : I agree with my friend Mr. No. 5 in-so-far as he pleads for a sense of realism to be brought into this discussion, and, motivated by a sense of realised. I ask : what will follow if the U.N.O. goes out of business today ? The answer evidently is that the groups just now enumerated by my friend will come to hold the field against each other openly and without restraint. To what stage a development like this can lead none can be in doubt. That would be tragic. Therefore, the only alternative before us is that the U.N.O with all its faults must continue to function. This is the only means available to us to stave off total destruction which otherwise stares us in the face. It will only come nearer if we write it off because whatever its failings, it is the only organization which keeps the nations of the world together.

In spite of what the pessimists might say, it has been growing in popularity and strength all through the last 27 years. Whereas there were only 50 members to begin with, the number has now gone up to 130. Even the big powers realise that the days when they could successfully bargain for the support of smaller nations and muster enough voting strength to carry through proposals unplatable to their rivals, have passed beyond recall. They can no longer have things

their own way. The right to veto is continuously under attack even in the Security Council. That shows that the organisation is trying to get rid of its weaknesses and there is every possibility that in course of time, its functioning will be very much reformed. I, therefore, do not agree that the U.N.O. is going to collapse, or should be wound up.

Group Discussion No. 19

SHOULD STUDENTS TAKE PART IN POLITICS ?

1st Candidate. G.T.O. and friends ! ***Aslam-o-Alaikum.***

Much dust of controversy has been raised round the question whether or not the students are qualified to take part in politics. Some people are of the opinion that politics must, under no circumstances, be allowed to divert students from their studies, while other believe that it is necessary for students to take a very active part in politics so that they may receive some training for the struggle that awaits them. In fact, the problem so far has been approached principally from three points of view :

(i) The orthodox,

(ii) The revolutionary, and

(iii) The moderate.

2nd Candidate. According to the orthodox view, politics is the last resort of a scoundrel. It corrupts the student's mind, and degenerates his moral character ; it develops in him a love of worldly values. By taking an active part in politics he neglects his funda-

mental duties of moral and intellectual advancement to which he is pledged as a student. He should therefore have no concern with the politics of the country and lead a life of single-minded devotion to his studies.

3rd Candidate. According to the revolutionary view, politics is one of the noblest gifts of modern human knowledge. In a free country, under the conditions of modern civilization, it is an important part of culture and education. To cut the students off from this new force in education is to deny democrary its true meaning, and to a country her own best. The lack of proper political training amounts to shelving politics to indefinite time and to uncertain hands.

4th Candidate. Those who take a moderate view of the situation suggest that full facilities should be given to the students to study the political life. It is a great folly to regard politics as a forbidden csubject to them and thus to keep them in dark about the various shanges that are developing in their country and abroad. What the ituation needs is not to deprive them of their interest in politics but to train them in the qualities of patient study and intelligent observation so that they might be enabled to express their interest in dignified and responsible ways. Political education should be imparted to them in their schools and colleges through :

(i) debates,

(ii) discussions, and

(iii) lectures,

5th Candidate. But so far as their active participation in political life is concerned we must draw a line. Political knowledge is good for them but no political agitation. It creates in them undesirable excitement, disturbs their studies, and hampers their moral and intellectual growth. They should, therefore, be the spectators of the side-line, rather than performers in the battle-field.

6th Candidate. After discussing these view-points, we draw our own conclusion. So far as the students' participation in the active political agitation is concerned, we must place some limits on it. Political knowledge is one thing but political agitation another. The former means their intellectual advancement but the latter signifies their complete ruin. So long as they study political problems from a detached and dispassionate point of view there is no harm but the moment they throw themselves into the heat and dust of active political agitatioa they contract numerous dangers to their personal and national life. On account of their impressionable age and heightened susceptibility to propaganda, they are likely to be easily deceived by interested groups and individuals of dubious political aims. They cannot cope with the subtleties of political propaganda, and are likely to do many things which are more harmful than helping to themselves and to their nation.

7th Candidate. The students of today are the citizens of tomorrow. A student who begins to take too early an interest in practical politics does harm to his country and to his career. Therefore, he should make himself fit for the task before he joins the field of politics. A soldier who is not drilled and disciplined proves a failure if not a menace.

8th Candidate. There are numerous ways in which the generous enthusiasm of the students for the service of their country can be profitably harnessed and their abundant energy utilized to promote the well-being of their country. They may be encouraged to take an active part in social and constructive programmes that lie before the country. Such activities will not only provide the necessary and useful outlets for engaging their surplus energy and spare time but will also help them in building their character. They will create in them a sense of responsibility, a spirit of co-operation and fellow-feeling, and above all, teach them valuable lessons in :

(i) initiative,

(ii) discipline, and

(iii) leadership.

Group Discussion No. 20

HAS MODERN SCIENCE ENHANCED MAN'S PRESTIGE ?

1st Candidate. Gentlemen ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

Science means "knowledge of things" which includes knowledge of this world and knowledge of the world to come. Allah may be praised for creating man and bestowing upon him the knowledge which guarantees him success both in this world and the next world. Referring to the Quran 96 : 4-5, we find that Allah says :

"He taught man by the pen. Taught man what he knew not".

It is the will of Allah that man should know the knowledge of the things of this world and should utilise them for making his life happier. There are many references here and there in the Quran which describe that Allah has created the universe and all between them for the service of man. According to the needs of man, Allah discloses their knowledge to man. We know that due to the increase in population, Allah has enabled man to make huge barrages, to produce electricity, make researches for various kinds of crops which give many fold output. Man cannot but thank his Creator as to how

He has enabled him to produce such species of rice which give hundred-fold output. Allah is always helpful to man for creating livelihood for him. He always makes advance arrangements for his livelihood. We see how He arranges for the nourishment of an infant in the womb of a woman, and before his birth, He arranges for his milk in the breasts of his mother. Then, how He puts the spirit of bringing him up in the heart of his mother, his father and other relatives. Analysing every item of the livelihood of man, we find that Allah is always helpful to him and it is His duty to do so because He has created him.

2nd Candidate. Science has provided us with more comforts. The system of telephone and electricity has given us many advantages. We get comfort from heat by using fans and refrigerators. The electrical system is again at our service in winter to warm us. Our telephone system helps us to talk to our men in the country and abroad. It also helps us to develop our business. It is, again, useful to us for keeping control on the frontiers of our territory.

3rd Candidate. Science has brought the world much closer. It has made the whole world as a sort of a family. It has, surely, raised man's prestige in the world.

4th Candidate. It has also helped man to be acquainted with the message of Islam. The system of press, the printing of the Quran and the Hadith, has gone a long way to propagate Islam in the world.

5th Candidate. Science is useful to man as long as man thinks and works for the welfare of man, but as soon as he becomes a destructive man, science begins to hurt him. Then, it makes our life unhappy and full of worries.

6th Candidate. Science makes us materialists. There is a mad race in the world for materialism. Materialism which lacks spiritualism is harmful for man.

7th Candidate. Science is enabling man to install factories and mills for the preparation of dreadful armaments. It enables him to produce atom bombts, hydrogen bombes, napalm bombs, and other kinds of destructive arms. The production of such oweful arms have destroyed Nagasaki and Hiroshima. The nuclear bombs which are prepared at present will ruin the mankind.

8th Candidate. The countries which are advanced in producing ruinous armaments are very proud. They do not pay any heed to ban of arms. They do not fulfil their agreements and do not abide by any pacts. Allah is watching the rebellious character of the *Kafir* nations and will destroy them with their own produced destructive armaments.

9th Candidate. Comparing the advantages and disadvantages of science, we find that its gains are more. It has brought more com-

forts to man than her harms. Hence it is quite obvious that the modern science has succeeded in enhancing the prestige of man in the world.

Group Discussion No. 21

Topic :

WAR IS INEVITABLE

(*P.M.A. Long Course*)

1st candidate : Friends, the fighting instinct is one of the basic human characteristics and the desire for adventure is a part of human nature. From the earliest known period of history, wars have been a prominent feature of man's life on earth. Against every single year of peace, history has recorded thirteen years of war. The early period in the annals of Pakistan, India, Egypt, Greece and Rome is full of tales of war and conquest, in each of which virile men have occupied the centre of the stage and won laurels by their heroic exploits. The legendary heroes continue to inspire young minds all over the world and induce among them the desire to stalk the earth like Colossuses winning glory for their motherland through display of valour, the right place for which is the battle-field. War is very much in the human character and as long as the human race inhabits the earth, it is inevitable.

2nd candidate : My friend, Mr. No. 1 has been carried away by the mistaken notion that man is essentially a brute, a slave to the baser instincts in his nature. Those of my friend's way of thinking forecast nothing but gloom for the human race and just refuse to take note of the bright spots which illuminate the horizon of civilization. Man has travelled a long way from the age when he was an ignorant slave of fear and violence. He has learnt to train and restrain his emotions and instincts so that there is hope of 'a good time coming'. The impulse has already been given and he is on his way to realizing that wars do not solve any problems, and that, on the other hand, if ever another world war breaks out, it will certainly lead to the total extermination of humanity. He has already seen enough horrors to embark upon the suicidal course again. We can depend upon man's inherent good sense and say that wars are a thing of the past and there is no possibility of the world being involved in the business again.

3rd candidate : I wish all of us here could share the optimistic view taken by my friend Mr. No. 2. At least I for one do not see any sign of "the good time coming", and I don't see how anyone can talk of such a thing in the midst of the feverish preparation going on all over the world for the final show-down. My able friend thinks that man has already seen enough horrors and that he would not go to war again but as a matter of fact, the horrors he has seen have by no means dampened his spirits. However horrible wars may become, man will always feel attracted by the prospect, even if for nothing but the relief war provides from the boredom and monotony of life in times of peace. A soldier going to the battle-front very well knows what he is in for but somehow he deludes himself in the belief that it is the next fellow who is going to die, and as for himself, he will have all the fun. Every now and then, ambitious leaders of men will appear on the world scene to fire such people's imagination with ideas of new worlds to conquer, and occasionally they will relieve the tedium of routine existence with sparks which will start world-conflagrations. War is one of the natural conditions of human life and cannot be avoided. It is inevitable.

4th candidate : My friend, Mr. No. 3 would have us believe that the whole human race is prepared to commit suicide at the bidding of any lunatic with enough personal hypnotism to fire men's imaginations with vision of new worlds to conquer. The havoc played by wars in the past with the economy of the most powerful nations, besides the trail of misery following in the wake of world-conflicts would be enough to deter any national leader from plunging his people into reckless adventures unless he has lost his head completely. The fate of attempts made by Germany during the first half of the present century is written across the pages of world history in tears and blood ; and it is extremely improbable if another people would take it into their heads to repeat the performance. Even then, the most we can say is that war may not be beyond the pale of possibility, but it is certainly not inevitable.

5th candidate : What my friend Mr. No. 4 has said may be logically true but it is hardly related to facts. We have not learnt to think collectively as members of the human race. A stage may come when we learn to think in that way but as long as nationalism holds sway, rivalries are bound to exist between nation and nation in the political and economic spheres. Powerful nations would continue trying to patronise the weaker nations and newly emerging powers will go on with their efforts to assert their presence. These tendencies will inevitably to lead war, and nations which do not prepare for war will always tempt those with surplus military capacity. Political and economic rivalries can hardly be removed by arbitration or merely by good words. Even in the face of strenuous efforts for the abolition of war as a means of settling international disputes, such inequities will cause wars till the whole world comes to be governed by a social system which eliminates economic disparities. That day is yet far off and till then, we have to accept war as inevitable.

6th candidate : That national rivalries continue to exist is hardly enough reason to conclude that this will lead inevitably to war. With the progress man has made in communications and means of transport, the world has become such a small place that no conflict can remain localised for long. It is no longer possible for any two nations to settle their differences by resort to arms and to wage a war in isolation. Other nations always jump into the fray. Wars of conquest or subjugation are a relic of the past. Neither has it been found possible to propagate ideologies by force. Consequently, in the present day world, war hardly serves any purpose and the time is not far off when statesmen of the world will realise its utter futility. Hope for mankind is still there. Everything is not lost. We may depend upon man's instinct of self-preservation to prevent repetition of past errors and renounce war for all purposes, and for all times.

7th candidate : I have been listening carefully to what my friends on both sides have had to say. In my opinion, those who consider war as a discarded phenomenon are indulging in purely wishful thinking. Instead of talking with our heads in the clouds, let us plant our feet firmly on this earth and then have a look at things. See what is going on in Vietnam, on the Kashmir border, on the banks of the Suez Canal, in Cyprus, on West German borders, on Arab Israel borders and in other places. All these conflicts are the rumblings of the Third World War which is going to be upon us before long. The poison that bedevils international relations is bound to result in some blood-letting before the world can breathe easily once again. To hope that these conflicts will be automatically resolved or go on indefinitely as they are without developing further is only wishing for the moon. War is not inevitable ; we are already in its midst.

8th candidate : To accept the thesis propounded by my friend Mr. No. 6 would mean rejecting all that the United Nations stands for. It would mean that all efforts to achieve disarmament, to ban nuclear tests etc. were nothing but hypocrisy on an international scale. However bleak the prospect may appear to be, I do not find it in my heart to believe that so many wise men of the world have been indulging in mere eye-wash for nearly two decades or that they were not motivated by sinc rity in their efforts to eliminate war from this world. I refuse to believe that men like Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan were victims of delusion and that their good work will have no effect and the world will again find itself in the throes of a suicidal conflict. In every country there are men of good sense, who are bound to exert their utmost to see that the fair name of their nation is not tranished as the initiator of a world catastrophe. I have full faith that ultimately the powers of peace will prevail and we shall not see the irony of another war to end all wars.

9th candidate : I am moved by the faith my friend Mr. No. 7 places in the United Nations Organization and its disarmament schemes. I have no doubt that numberless people all over the earth share that faith but it is a tragic fact that these efforts to eliminate

war from the earth are sure to go waste. We are already witnessing how the U N.O. has been paralysed in the game of power-politics. It is already reduced to the position of a helpless spectator, while conflicts go on erupting all over the world. Is it in a position today to do something about Vietnam and Arab Israel conflict ? My friend Mr. No. 7 may not believe it but it is a fact that those who profess love for peace indulge in mere lip-service and they are deceiving the world by inculcating a false sense of security among the peoples of the earth. The clouds of war hang heavy over mankind once again and we have no choice but to prepare for another holocaust of death and destruction

Group Discussion No. 22

Topic :

IS MAN'S RACE TO THE MOON WASTEFUL AND FUTILE ?

(*C.S.S. 1971*)

First candidate : The launching, performance and recovery of Apollo progromme marked a new stage in the achievements of human ingenuity and inventiveness. Likewise, the heroism of the brave men who undertook the extremely hazardous missions also deserve the highest praise. But without belittling the fantastic progress made by human technology and the indomitable spirit of men, let us ask ourselves what useful purpose, if any this race to the moon is serving, or in other words, how it is benefiting mankind. From what has been appearing in the Press, we learn that the total cost of the Apollo programme is going to be no less than twenty four billion dollars. Judging from the standards of an affluent country like the U.S.A. even, that sum represents a considerable amount of money which can easily serve to make happier the lot of thousands upon thousands of under-priveleged human being on this earth As compared to this, the advantages men may be able to secure from a conquest of the moon possess, if at all, very dubious merit. At best, it may enable man to colonise the moon, but as far as its suitability to sustain human life is concerned, even on the basis of available data, the moon comes nowhere near the earth. If the object is to bring back from it new minerals and diamonds, the landed cost of such lunar materials will be prohibitive. Then why this wild-goose chase ? While groping for an answer, I feel inclined to agree with what Kingsley Martin, the well-known British leftwing writer had to say the other day. He attributes the race to the moon to "the desire to kill more people more quickly and effectively". It is thus a horrible game, and we cannot but condemn it, not only as worthless and futile but also as havi g in it the seeds of disaster for mankind.

2nd candidate : I admit that the strictly utilitarian angle from which my predecessor has examined man's race for the moon does represent a certain point of view. There are many of the way of thinking of my friend, Mr. No. 1. But if we were to adopt their way of

thinking, we shall end up evaluating everything on one criterion only—how far it can help to sustain life. One that criterion, all beauty, all adventure and all love would appear to be useless and all art futile. Such a pronouncement would obviously be preposterous. Those who think like Mr. No. 1, forget that man does not live by bread alone. He needs faith, sympathy and admiration an equal measure if not more than he needs shelter, bread and clothes. He is endowed with an insatiable curiosity which manifests itself as thirst for knowledge.

There is something in him which goads him to accept challenges, be it the challenge of a mountain-peak which defies climbing the challenge of a difficult journey fraught with dangers or the challenge of the unknown vastnesses of space. It is this indomitable spirit of man which overcomes all obstacles that block his path, and helps him attain the glory of achievement, defying the heaviest odds. The urge to explore the universe beyond our own planet is not a product of the twentieth century. It has kept human imagination aglow for centuries now from the time when the legend of Icarus was created, to Jules Verne, Edgar Allen Poe and H.G. Wells.

What we are seeing is the translation of fiction into fact. This has been the principal avocation of man for ages. Once the new world was fiction, to-day it is a fact. Once the wireless was fiction; to-day it is a fact. For as long as man exists he will go on turning fiction into fact whatever the detractors of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake may say. Far from being worthless and futile it is the only thing worth doing.

3rd candidate : My able predecessor has sought to establish that the race for the moon that we are witnessing is inspired by man's thirst for knowledge. He is most welcome to hold on to his belief but in reality, the facts point the other way. If we study the progress and motivations of space research ever since Yurl Gagrin went up in April 1961, we shall be led unavoidably to the conclusion that instead of being something in the nature of a quest for knowledge the race for being the first to land a man on the moon is a product of the post-war rivalry between the two big powers in the world, *viz*. the U.S.A. and the U.S.R. It was the U.S.A. which first set itself the goal of placing a man on the moon and the announcement was made by President Kennedy at a time when the U.S.A. was suffering from a crisis of morale brought on by the Bay of pigs fiasco and further aggravated by the lead Russia had gained by becoming the first to put a man into orbit round the earth. Kennedy said "I believe this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth". This was countered by Khrushchev in a statement he issued in 1963 saying that the Soviet Union did not regard itself as being in the moon race. But more than being a declaration of intent, it was intended to show up Kennedy's did as something wasteful and pointless. In reality those who say that it was the sputniks which sustained Khrushchev in power for as long as he remained there are not far wrong.

Now, viewed in the context of the running rivalry between the super-powers the race to the moon may appear to make some sense. But if we look at it in the larger context of humanity a large part of which

groans under an unbearable weight of want and suffering the whole thing appears to be childish and silly. Why take into account only the sums America is going to spend on the Apollo programme. Consider also the roubles Russia is pouring into it. Add up the two and you have all the resources that may be needed to remake this world in God's own image.

4th candidate : I must say my able friend Mr. 3 is very well-informed of facts. He has correctly traced the international motivations of space research. He is right that as far as the super-powers are concerned their interest in the race to the moon, is based more on mutual rivalry than on anything else. We may even agree with Kingsley Martin that the race in motivated by the desire to be the first to secure a vantage point from where maximum destruction can be wrought. I am afraid all this amounts to missing the wood for the trees. Whatever it may be that moves the big nations to pour big money into space-research, it is made possible only by the co-operation of those courageous young people who have no often braved the hazards of the unknown and added to the sum-total of human knowledge.

What they have accomplished could not have been done by more automations acting on orders. To decry the race for the moon as nothing more than a manifestation of rivalry between the super-powers as a offering gratuitous insult to the so heroic young people. And befoer setting out to condemn the race to the moon as something wasteful and futile, let us consider the benefits that have accrued to mankind from space research. It has enabled us to build "a world-wide space-communication array, an automatic check-out and monitering system, for complex rockets and spacecraft, a sophisticated data athering and transmission system, the technique of landing on and leaving another planet", etc. Considering all this, I do not really see how anybody can dub the whole thing as something wasteful and futile. It is right that as yet we do not know what benefits man may directly derive from conquering the moon, but even from the bye-products it would appear that the journey has been far from futile.

5th candidate : My friends, Mr. No. 4 has enumerated a really impressive list of achievements which can surely be placed to the credit of those engaged in the task of space-research, of which the race to the moon is a part. I also agree with him when he says that we cannot belittle the heroism of the young people who have risked their lives exploring the unknown. But when all this has been said and done, may I ask how a starving child in Biafra has benefitted by it or how it has helped a family orphaned by the war in Vietnam. Whatever may be said to the contrary the plain fact is that the race to the moon is in the final analysis nothing but a manifestation of the big power's rivalry for power and prestige. It has been said here that they seek to gain tactical advantage over each other by this means. Another point of view is that we are seeing a contest of international one-upmanship. Both points of view are right. It has lately acquired a third dimension. Having come to acquire too much affluence, West Germany proposes to siphen off some extra marks into a programme of space-research. It will undoubtedly

give a boost of her prestige to become the third space power in the world. But would it not have been better for her to have used the affluence for relieving human distress. The achievements of Apollo 8 to 16 have greatly added to the prestige of U.S.A. and put her in the lead in the race to the moon. Even so, quite a sizeable section of public

opinion in that country is clamouring for slashing down the funds being made available for space-research so that more money can be found for earth-based problems. Even the nationals of the country foremost in the field of space research condemn the whole thing as wasteful. That should hardly leave any room for doubt on this score.

6th candidate : It has been quite an interesting discussion in which the utilitarians as well as those who advocate—knowledge for the sake of knowledge have fared equally well. Listening to the speakers on both sides it struck me more than once that this discussion is merely an extension of the ageold debate over which one should have precedence science or technology. The scientist says he pursues knowledge for the sake of knowledge unmindful of its actual utility.

The technologist says of what use is that knowledge which cannot be put to practical use ? The quarrel ends the moment both of them realise how interdependent they are How could technology have developed, had it not been for men dedicated to the cause of expanding the frontiers of human knowledge? And had it not been for the technologist how could the benefits of pure science have been made available to mankind? Both are thus equally important. For the present we may not be able to see clearly how space-research is going to help mankind but we may be sure that ultimately the technologists will be able to turn the fruits of this research to good account. We cannot therefore be justified in calling the race to the moon something wasteful and futile.

Group Discussiun No. 23

Topic .

THE INCREASING SPEED OF LIFE IS A MENACE

(*C.S.S.* 1971)

1st candidate : Friends ! the proposition before us today is very interesting in that it invites serious thoughts. There can be no doubt that life to-day is picking up speed very fast, and this reminds me of a story. A villager once went to a big city. On returning home after a few days, he gave his cronies a glowing account of all that he had seen in the big place. Having listened to the story, a yokel said he too would go and see everything for himself. The narrater thereupon said, "You may go if you will. But what's the use now ? The people there were rushing in all directions in all sorts of vehicles in such a great hurry that by now the place must be totally deserted. "In a way this is a true picture of the contemporary world—at least those parts of it which are known as civilised. Everybody seems to be in a terrible hurry, so that none has any time to stand and stare.

All the time it is a rat race in full fury—a race for power and pelf which has given birth to the acquisitive society of today. This society has its sights firmly fixed on material comfort and well-being to the exclusion of everything else. Modern civilisation worships at the shrine of Mammon. And what is this reward ? In the relentless pursuit of pleasure, it has lost all happiness. It has become a stranger to the joy of living which is the spice of life. It may have gained materially but it has lost its soul. In fact it has come to suffer from a sickness of the spirit. It is that sickness which is manifesting itself in the new craze for pseudo—spirituality presently being exploited by self-styled pirs offering short cuts to spiritual peace. It is the very same sickness of soul which is driving more and more people every day to using tranquillisers, halucinogens and even suicide. The havoc wrought by the increasing speed of life is more evident in the West because the pace is faster there. The East too is gradually catching up, and a similar state of affairs is bound to manifest itself here also. The increasing pace of life is indeed a menace.

2nd **candidate :** While the world has entered the era of space, it is a deplorable fact that many of us continue to live in the age of the bullock cart, or at least hark bark to it nostalgically. Such people feel scared of speed and would rather continue to move at the proverbial snail's pace, unmindful of the value of time. They have no use for seconds, minutes and hours. They believe in eternity only and would rather sit by the river-side meditating on the deluge to come rather than be up and doing for their own and other's well-being They look with disdain on all efforts to improve the world in which they are living and would rather have all of us revert to the primitive stage. To my mind such people wherever they exist, are a drag on progress. They are men without ambition, without any zest for life, with nothing to look forward to, and waiting only for divine deliverance. Whatever they say or do it will not slow down the pulsating, bouncing flow of the river of life. Nothing will stop man from moving faster and faster still and charting unexplored domains.

He will go on finding ways of filling his life with more beauty and more comfort. The primitive man was more of a beast of burden and less of a thinking animal. Civilisation is the process of reversing this ratio. The process has gone on for thousands of years now, and it is foolishness to think of putting the clock back. And modern man is surely much better off than his ancestors could ever be. My friend, Mr. No. 1 has complained that the pace of life these days does not leave us with any time to stand and stare. His complaint is genuine in so far as it refers to those who wish to idle away their time. But it is not valid in relation to the working population of the world Increasing automation and more efficient and speed-means of production have served to reduce the rigours of work and made possible the introduction of the 36-hour week which leaves people with enough leisure, well-earned. My friend has also said that as a result of the increasing speed of life, men are becoming over-covetuous, and losing their peace of mind But can it be blamed squarely on the pace of modern life ? It only shows that man's

spiritual progress has not kept pace with his material progress. In other words, while science has been active, religion has been content with taking a back seat. The blame obviously lies elsewhere, and there is no justification for finding fault with the speed of life.

3rd candidate : Our able friend Mr. No. 2 just now made a very pertinent observation. He said that man's spiritual progress has not kept pace with his material progress. But he has not cared to say how this has come about. It is very obvious that man has been so busy with the pursuit of material happiness that he has ignored his spiritual well-being. He has failed to strike a balance between the two with the result that while he has made progress in one direction, he has suffered in the other direction. In the material sense he has grown richer, but morally he has suffered a decline. This in turn has led to the commercialisation of nearly everything religion, politics, education, sex. Man has reached the stage where he knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. He has got used to evaluating in terms of money and everywhere we see people running after money at a break-neck speed. Every other man appears to be after getting rich quick, without stopping to think whether the means he is employing for the purpose are legitimate or not. This has induced into life a sort of recklessness which we see reflected everywhere and that is generally mistaken for speed. I concede that what my predecessor said about faster means of production enabling workers to have more leisure is true. But how many are there who can fill their leisure intelligently? Most of them have to 'kill' time. Leisure hangs heavy on them because they are weary of themselves. This weariness is a sign of sickness in the soul and to forget it people have devised bizarre means of entertainment like strip-tease shows which are slur on the name of civilization, and serve only to make the disease worse. The basic cause of this spiritual sickness is the artificiality introduced into life in the name of speed, and it can be cured only if we can regulate our pace in such a manner that, side by side with working for material progress, we allow ourselves time to reflect on the eternal values and beauty of life which can never be measured in terms of money. In the hectic pace of present-day life we see them as no more than hazy blurs receding from view at great speed.

4th candidate : I believe all of us have listened carefully to what our able friends, Mr. No. 1 and Mr. No. 3 have been trying to say. They have been at great pains to establish that the increasing speed of life is a menace. If we have been able to understand them properly, the main argument they have adduced in favour of their thesis is that the pace of modern life has caused spiritual sickness in man. Gentlemen it is not surprising to hear such talk in the year 1971 A.D., the year in which man accomplished a return journey to the moon. Going by what our friends have been saying Frank Borman and Neil Armstrong must be spiritually the sickest men on earth today. But is that so? Whether speed is a menace or not, it cannot be gainsaid that the present is the age of speed something definitely not good for weak hearts. Mr. No. 3 has said that the pace of life today is artificial, I say no, it is not. It is conditioned by the spirit of the times which are changing fast. Simultaneously so

much else is undergoing change, and if we refuse to change with the times, the world is not going to wait for us, it is only we who will lag behind. I do not agree with my friend when they see unmitigated decline in moral values. I do however concede that with increase in the speed of life, all values moral, social, religious, cultural, political are in ferment and this may well be a preparation for new values more in tune with the age being evolved. Naturally we cannot identify their features just now, but all of us know at least this much that the law of change is inexorable. May be that a more permissive society is taking shape but however distasteful it may be to the partisans of old values they cannot stop its birth. The increasing speed of life is something natural and inevitable, and it is certainly not a menace. Life and the laws governing it have always been subject to change and it has infinite capacity for adjustment.

5th candidate : Friends, as I was trying to gather my thoughts on the subject before us I was reminded of a line from Emerson. He has said, "The civilized man has built a coach but has lost the use of his feet." This one line from the celebrated essayist gráphically conveys to us in what manner the increasing speed of life has become a menace for man. It is the manner in which, in his craze for speed, he is becoming more and more dependent on the machine. The machineage has no doubt imparted speed to life, but the speed-mania it has at the same time conditioned man's way of thinking in a manner which is not good for him. Perhaps the most grievous loss he has suffered is that he has lost the qualities of patience and perseverance. The latest catchword is 'instant' and the vogue is 'instant coffee' instant divorce 'journalism' 'instant divorce' etc. All this haste has had a very deleterious physical effect on man. He suffers today from frayed nerves and heart ailments as he never did in the past. He has become a chronic worrier, a host for ulcers and cancer. And he is not content to have his own worries alone. Every minute of the day with the help of extra-fast means of communications, the press and the radio make him share the worries of the world. Increased knowledge and greater speed have brought for him only suffering in their wake, and he secretly pines for the days when ignorance was bliss Increase in the speed of life has certainly not proved a blessing for him.

Group Discussion No. 24

Topic :

MAN IS HEADING TOWARDS SELF-DESTRUCTION

(*C.S.S. 1970*)

1st candidate : Friends, those of us who agree with the proposition before us to day may well be put down as incurable pessimists but it is a deplorable reality that man is heading towards self-destruction. What else can be the logical outcome of the mad race which is going on and on at an ever-accelerating pace for more and more efficient

weapons of destruction ? We hear much pious talk of peaceful co-existence, dis-armament, plans to stop proliferation of nuclear weapons etc. All these themes have been in the air for nearly two decades now, and, unless we are chronic self-deceivers, we should by now know that the talk about them is more propagandist than sincere. The gap between what the great powers of the world profess and what they practise is too big to be explained away by even the most astute reasoning. All that we can say about the performance is that it is a superb tongue-in-cheek act, an excellent eyewash. The attitude of suspicious defensiveness towards each other among world nations is too deeply entrenched to allow any relaxation in the continuing arms build-up in rival camps. In the capitalist countries, it is being further bolstered by powerful business interests in the armaments trade because these merchants of death can prosper only if international tensions are kept alive. They have created a vicious circle which has sucked in even the socialist states. The exigencies of an unending cold war have forced all major world powers to-day to shift to war-economy. The world is on its way towards total annihilation. Nothing short of a miracle can reverse the direction, but unfortunately the age of miracles is long past. Man is virtually sitting on a powder-keg. The fuses are all set. Any fool who chooses to light a match-stick to-day can inscribe "the end" on the saga of man.

2nd candidate : The picture of unrelieved gloom painted before us just now by our friend, Mr. No. 1 is enough to give the jitters to the bravest among us. I too should have been struck dumb by its tragic grandeur, had it not been for an unshakable faith in the essential greatness of the human spirit. In building up his case, my friend had proceeded on the assumption that the world-powers are not sincere in their approach towards problems of disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. I must say the assumption is entirely fallacious. It amounts to condemning at one stroke all those who have worked and all those who are working for world peace, as hypocrites. This is to say, the least, a slur on man like Jinnah and Liquat Ali Khan who devoted their lives to earnest efforts for promoting peace on earth and goodwill towards men. And however cynical we may be, we cannot say that their efforts bore no fruit. Looking through the dark glasses of pessimism, my friend has missed the rays of hope which are breaking through the gloom. My friend has said that the age of miracles is past. No, Sir, even to-day miracle like Tashkent and Simla accord can come to pass. Even to-day, the preference for sanity inherent in human nature can assert itself. There is no occasion to lose all hope. In fact all of us would be the better for a little more faith in man and his essential goodness I do not think we are heading towards self-destruction.

3rd candidate : My friend, Mr. No. 2, has appealed to all of us to have a little more faith in the essential goodness of man. May I ask whether we of the present generation and even these of an earlier generation have any faith left in anything ? This is the age of reason. Man has become a slave of the intellect. Shorn of faith, he was fallen a victim to his own ingenuity. The inventor of machines has himself

become an automation, totally unmindful of the consequences of his actions. Scientists are using their knowledge to wreak destruction on mankind. Power-mad politicians goaded by tycoone of commerce are constantly engaged in dangerous brinkmanship in order to further what is called "national self-interest" as also their own ambitions. They can any day push the world off the precipice and bring on a catastrophe. Men of faith and goodwill are scoffed at and treated as eccentrics. The mass of common people everywhere is frustrated. Modern art and literature concentrate on the morbid and the abnormal. Moral laxity and mental diseases are on the increase. The race of man has lost its peace of mind in general. It is a lost generation which inhabits the world to-day.

All this is the natural out-come of the prostitution of the intellect. There is nothing which can save man from the natural consequences of his sin. However much we may wish that things should take a different course, the inexorable logic of events points in the other direction. The son of Adam appears to be under the influence of some horrible curse. He is already far-advanced on the path of self-destruction. The final catastrophe may be followed by regeneration, but for the present his fate is sealed. He is doomed to destruction.

4th candidate : My predecessor has made a valiant effort to rise the level of the discussion here to a high philosophical pitch, and in the process, he has proclaimed the doom of humanity with superb self-assurance. But all that his excursion into the realms of pure thought has produced is a plethora of puerile and vague generalizations which are misleading because they are divorced from reality. My friend has condemned the present generation as a faithless generation, a lost generation. The gravemen of his charge is that in the present day world, faith and spiritual values are on the decline. I would submit that it is not faith and spiritual values which are on the decline. It is ignorance and dogma which thrives on ignorance which are on the decline. As in every other sphere, there is a continuing renaissance in the sphere of faith also. Modern man finds solace in an enlightened faith more in accord with his changed spiritual needs. While on the one hand he has rejected serfdom and fascist philosophies, on the other he has also discarded the tyranny of hide-bound religious tradition. The spread of education and the introduction of better means of communication and transport have served to widen his mental horizon, and we can claim a higher general standard of culture than our forefathers. Nations of the world have become more civilized and force as a way of solving international disputes is being increasingly rejected. The virtues of international co-operation and peaceful co-existence are better appreciated to-day than they ever were in the past. The age of power-mad politicians who could plunge the whole world into war is gone. To-day's rulers know that one false move, one step they take towards disturbing the peace of the world can cost them their thrones. The people in all parts of the world known about the terrible alternatives for peace in existence to-day, and they are in no mood to allow anybody to play with the future of mankind.

There is a good time coming and man is sure to scale new moral, material and spiritual heights in the coming years. I see no reason for endorsing the proposition before us.

5th candidate : As my friend, Mr. No. 4 was speaking. I was feeling as if I was being taken on a conducted tour of Utopia. Well, the world full of peace and promise of which he has just now spoken in such glowing terms would be a really wonderful place to live in, if only it had existed outside over-fertile imaginations. The world that you and I know of is very much different. It is a world full of strife, dissensions and trouble-spots. At a dozen places, fires are burning which threaten to spread and engulf the whole world. Vietnam, Kashmir, Nigeria, Yemen, Middle East, Rhodesia, N. Ireland are the manifestations of something very different from the urges for peaceful co-existence and co-operation of which my able friend has spoken. It is in these places that we can see to what depths man has sunk or is capable of sinking. If there is one field in which he can be said to have made any progress it is the field of hypocrisy. He has learnt the art of talking through his hat In one breath he talks about banishing hunger from this earth, and in the other proceeds to wipe out entire defenceless population by raining hell from the air. On the one hand, he talks about self determination for the people of a neighbouring country and on the other denies basic human rights to his own countrymen. The freedom-fighters in Aden face police bullets while rebels in Rhodesia have everything the way they want. It is on the whole a disgusting spectacle. I don't say this sort of hypocrisy is universal and unredeemed. Exceptions, and very honourable exceptions, have been there and are there. But exceptions only prove the rule. In spite of all his claims to being cultured and civilized, man is still very much subject to primitive passions like fear, hatred and violence. The culture and refinement he bosts of are not more than shik-deep. Basically, he remains the brute he ever was, and if he is marching towards self-destruction, it is but natural. War is one of his natural instincts, and however strong the "forces on the side of peace" may be, this natural instinct is bound to assert itself and result in his destruction.

6th candidate : My friend, Mr. No. 5 and those among us who agree with his way of thinking will excuse me if I differ with them in regard to the conclusions they have drawn from the present-day state of affairs. I am one of those who ardently believe that the natural state of man is peace, and not war, and that the essence of his nature is good and not evil. He is too noble a creation of God to have been doomed to self-destruction. It is true that his strewn with difficulties, and before finding his ultimate destiny, he will have to over-come a host of hurdles, including the baser elements in his own nature, but there can be hardly any doubt that like Sisyphus, he will in the end achieve the mountain top. Difficulties must not make us afraid and disheartened. We can probably never have roses, roses all the way. Thorns too will be there. If there are a few individuals who cannot see the roses for the thorns or who are too afraid of the thorns to venture forth, it does not mean that the march of humanity will come to a stop. To believe

that man is heading for self-destruction is to give up hope. It betrays a negative attitude of mind, which distorts the vision. As important as the realities is the way in which we look at them.

Let us try to look at it this way. Twice in the course of the last fifty years, man has felt the necessity of forming some sort of an international organization with the primary object of preventing war. The age of secret diplomacy is over and today all international differences are discussed in the full glare of publicity so that the whole world can know and judge who is in the wrong secret alliances and treaties are no longer possible in this era of open diplomacy. Economic barriers between nation and nation are crumbling. The more prosperous nations of the world are becoming increasingly aware of their responsibility to help the under developed regions economically. The war to banish poverty, ignorance and disease from this earth is being waged with international co-operation. International collaboration in the sphere of scientific research is increasing. These are all significant developments which definitely hold the promise of a more peaceful and prosperous future for mankind. As compared to these conflicts mentioned by my friend. Mr No. 5 are no more than ripples on the surface. In any case efforts to localise these and other such conflicts have been successful. The bogey of an impending nuclear catastrophe is more imaginary than real because nuclear weapons have been developed primarily as weapons of defence and they have made the prospect of a world so terrible that it has become one of the imponderables.

On the whole, I see no reason to despair. All the disagreements and conflicts in the world' notwithstanding, man is on his way to building a better world rather than heading towards self-destruction.

Group Discussion No. 25

IDLENESS

1st Candidate. Gentlemen, *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

Idleness relieves, a man from work. "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy". A man who is always busy in his work loses his health. As idleness supplies relief from hard work, so it is a kind of blessing. For a happly and healthy life, a man should find some time for idleness in his life.

2nd Candidate Stevenson is very justified in defending the case of idleness. According to him, idleness does not mean doing nothing at all but doing something which is not acknowledged by society as work. Interpreted in that sense, "idleness" includes quiet thinking of the objects of nature, moving about on the roads with open eyes, making new friends for the sake of it playing upon a musical instruments, etc. This kind of idleness is very useful

3rd Candidate. My friends were just defending idleness which is curse and an evil. I do not agree with them. A thing which has more harms than its benefits must be condemned. Even poison which brings death to a man has got some benefits. We cannot recommend it on account of its negligible advantages. We witness that an idler is hated in society by everybody. He is an anti-social element.

4th Candidate. An idler shirks work and thus lives in a poor condition. He cannot improve his financial condition. He is condemned by his relatives and others.

5th Candidate. In some cases, an idler is a wealthy man. Having plenty of money, a rich man tends to become idle.

6th Candidate. Idleness causes mischief. An idler will begin a false rumour, plan an intrigue, think of destruction of someone, or talk ill of others. An idle brain is a workshop of devil.

7th Candidate. As there is very much work to be done in the world for a man, so idleness must be discouraged.

8th Candidate. Idleness has been condemned by all great men of the world. The great Muslim writers and poets have condemned idleness. In his "*Mosaddas*", Maulana Altaf Hussain Hali has condemmed idleness in most severe words. The Maulana compares an idler with an animal who attaches no more value of life than feeding her own belly. The Maulana says :

> "They (idlers), like animals are satisfied with only feeding their bellies".

Group Discussion No 26

THE WORLD ACCORDING TO YOUR HEART'S DESIRE

1st Candidate. Gentlemen ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

I desire that the man must be successful in this temporary world and the everlasting Hereafter. This is possible only if man links himself with Islam. Islam gives mankind a balanced life both for this world and the Hereafter. I desire that there should be implement of Islam in the world so as to eradicate evil from it.

2nd Candidate. I desire that there should be an implementation of Islamic laws in the world. This step will enjoin upon the mankind to do good deeds and abstain from evil. Islam will establish an international justice for mankind. This will promote peace in the world which is the urgent demand of the whole mankind at present.

3rd Candidate. I desire that the enforcement of Islamic law in the world should end corruption in the world. Islam lays great punishments upon those people who are corrupt.

4th Candidate. I am in favour of Islam because it distributes property both among man and woman. It places everybody on sound financial footing.

5th Candidate. I desire that there should be an enforement of Islamic punishments because they establish law and order in the world. The world which is wronged and injured by the false man-made laws will be relieved by the enforcement of the law of Shariah.

6th Candidate. I desire that the emforcement of Islamic laws should end superstition, ignorance, illiteracy and fanaticism from the world.

7th Candidate. I endorse that Islamic laws should be enforced in the world so that man should know the aim of his life and death in this world. The establishment of an Islamic era in the world will enable a man to lead a successful life both in this world and the Hereafter. And this is the sole aim of man's life in this quite temporary world.

Group Discussion No: 27

SHOULD MEN AND WOMEN HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS OF DIVORCE ?

1st Candidate. G.T.O., Sir and friends ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

The days for slavery of women are gone, therefore women should get equal rights of divorce with men. The Western people allow them more rights and acknowledge that the woman-folk is a "better-half" of the man-folk. In the Western countries the women are allowed to give divorce to men. In those countries husbands have to undergo a lot of difficulties and have to spend much for giving divorce to their wives.

2nd Candidate. It is better to get separation for a wife than to live under a cruel husband, and, therefore she should be given equal them more values than rights of divorce with man.

3rd Candidate. The Western women complain that their husbands do not give them more values than mere toys. Whenever they are fed up with sexual thirst, they divorce them. In these circumstances women should be given rights to divorce their husbands.

4th Candidate. It is more convenient for a Western woman to divorce her husband. The Western woman is very free to give divorce to her husband. There are frequent cases of divorces in the Western countries both from wives and husbands. There are numerous societies and unions of both oppressed divorced wives and husbands in those countries to safeguard their rights.

Please allow me to furnish some details about the complaints of Western women against their husbands and the complaints of the husbands against their wives.

Ata-ul-Haq Qasmi, a Pakistani who had a chance to live in America for some time, has furnished some details about the condition of husbands and wives in those countries. The daily Urdu newspaper "*Nawa-i-Waqt*" quotes his writing in this manner

"As long as we remained in America, we kept on hearing complaints of the wives against the cruel behaviour of their husbands and the complaints of husbands against the cruelties of their wives. Once or twice we got chances to become mediators. On such occasions if we decide a matter in favour of a woman, then we were called as 'servant of woman' and if we decide a matter in favour of a man, then we were called as 'partial'. The opressed wives and husbands have formed societies for the safeguard of their rights. The unions of wives frame the following charges upon their husbands :

1. Our husbands consider us as inferior to them in every field and then they misbehave us in that way.
2. Being defeated in verbal quarrel with us they come to blows with us, and then in order to prove their physical superiority, they begin to beat us severely whereas the blows which we cause them are not so hard.
3. After working in offices and factories for eight hours, we have also to do some household work. The trouble of creating children, brining them up and some other such difficulties are also added in our duties. In this way we have to do much more hard work than our husbands.
4. Ninety nine per cent husbands are failures to their wives. And if a woman demonstrates against the highhandedness of her husband, then he takes out a pistol against her.
5. Our husbands do not pay us more respect than a toy. When they are fed up with sexual epitite, then they divorce us."

5th Candidate. I have also read the article of Ata-ul-Qasmi, about which my friend Mr. 4th Candidate was talking about. This description is very interesting one. Please allow me to tell you something about the complaints of the Western husbands against their tyrant wives. 'The unions for safeguards of the rights of husbands complain against the cruelties of their wives in the following way :

1. "This is right that their wives work in offices and factories, but all their income is spent by them on their make-up decorations and their shoping. So there should not be any daunt on us in this regard.
2. They do not give so much care to household work as they should give. So much so that the food at home is cooked very rarely. We have to eat often from hotels
3. The children are deprived of the love and rearing up of their mothers which is increasing gap in generation.

4. We are their figurative gods, but they do not pay us more respect than an honourary husband. The Bible commands them to be obedient to their husbands, but these wives do not supply us any fodder.

5. In a case of divorce, the husband has to bear much financial weight whereas a wife is quite free from all these financial worries".

"With regard to the last item, the sentiments of the husbands are very deep. If anybody takes up this topic with them, then it appears that they will just burst into tears. We remember that a man named Charles Tipner had written a big book on that subject. The book begins with these words

'I am also one of the wretched husbands who has been oppressed and injured. My lawyer ruined me. I was deprived of my son and my worldly possession. My fame was injured. But I have made up my mind now that I will not allow anybody else to suffer like that'.

"His determination was witnessed in the fact that he had formed a Union of the divorced husbands. And he was elected as its President. During our stay in America he had convened a press conference in which he had severely attacked the American law and those people who made that law. During this period wherever there occurred the mention of the lawyers and the Judges, he called them as *goondas* and corrupt people, because he considered that both the categories of these people were in league with the women. The proof of his talk is that in cases of divorces the eventual success is that of a woman. In this case, apart from the failure of the husband against her wife, the husband has to bear huge expenses of paying heavy fees of the lawyers, food, etc. He was saying that the same women who demand the freedom of women, are not caring at all in the cases of divorce. Why this principle of divorce is not kept in view. What does it mean that a woman who gives divorce to her husband sleeps a sound sleep, whereas if a husband even imagines about giving divorce to his wife, it is a dreadful scene for him. The wife-oppressed man was saying that the wives who were demanding for keeping their children with them was only a way to force a husbands to snatch away money from the husband. His argument was that the women were working in offices and factories like men, they were attending night clubs, cinemas and some other such night functions like their men, whereas their children remain at home in that period, and that the women acquire the services of baby sisters for the bringing up of their children. Why men cannot perform that work."

"We have forgotten to tell you that this oppressed husband had already been divorced twice by his cruel wives. At that time he was living with his third wife. This man has also established a society of lawyers for the lawful help of the forcibly divorced husbands, the membership of which at that time was more than 7000."

6th Candidate. My two Islamic-minded learned friends Mr. 4th Candidate and 5th Candidate were giving very interesting disclosures about the oppressed divorced husbands and wives in the misguided

Western Christian world through the tongue of a Pakistani Ata-ul-Qasmi who had spent some time in America. Now please allow me to add some words of the most Islamic minded President of the present Muslim world Col. Moammar al-Gaddafi of Libya, who had a painful impression of the destruction of family, the divorces and the condition of women during his stay in Britain as a student. The President spoke in detail about the exploitation of women in the West and added : "We do not have the same anxieties as the Westerners. We have certainly... In the Holy Quran we have the answers to all

the questions raised by the people like French philosopher Sartre". He urged the newsmen to read the Holy Quran even if they were not Muslims.

The saviour of Islam and Allah-sent helper of the whole present Muslim world –Col. Moammar Al-Qaddhafi was making these remarks while he was telling that the aim of the Libyan cultural revolution was a return to original Islam. He added, "We want to get rid of the layers superimposed by the colonisation on our thought and our real identities". Explaining the cultural revolution to foreign journalists in detail, the President said that the Chinese Cultural Revolution was a struggle between two groups for power, but this was not the case with the Libyan experiment. "The Chinese Cultural Revolution sought new principles, he added : "for us Libyans, on the contrary, the revolution is a return to the origins of Islam".

7th Candidate. My learned friend Mr. 6th Candidate was just now furnishing painful remarks of Islam-loving President of the Muslim world, Col. Al-Qaddhafi about the defective divorce system of the disbelieving world. Now please allow me to complete the remarks of Mr. Ata-ul-Haq Qasmi, about which my learned friends Mr. 5th Candidate and 6th Candidate were talking in respect of dangerous effects of the divorce system among men and women in the misguided Christian world. Mr. Ata-ul-Haq Qasmi had remarked that the Muslim husbands of the world were very fortunate as they have not to enter into any worry even in case of giving divorces to their innocent Muslim wives. I hope you will enjoy to hear the original words of Ata-ul-Haq Qasmi which are as follows :

"When we retured to Pakistan from America, our relatives and friends congratulated us for not bringing with us foreign ladies as our wives. They described our action as a good sign of belonging to a good family. They were saying that there were other people who may not bring anything from the foreign countries but they will surely bring foreign ladies

that we have a greater sense of learning lession from others who were entangled in marrying foreign women. In those foreign countries, there is a great respect for a man as long as he does not marr. But what h. ppens to men after their marriage in the foreign countries is very pitiable as you have read above. On the contrary, Pakistan is a paradise for husbands. You can speak a few words of love with your wife and then you can persuade her to give up her jointure ([illegible]). You can sell her ornaments and can destory it in ordinary things. You can threaten her on this thing or that thing, you can beat her. Whatever hard behaviour you may adopt about her, she will remain your obedient servant. The parents of the wife are always fearful from the relatives of the husband. You can also emphasise upon the mind of the relatives of the wife that the relatives of the wife have to show obedience to the relatives of the husband. On this plea you can misbehave the whole family of the wife. You can place many restrictions upon the family members of the your wife. They dare not speak even a single word against the husband or his other relatives. If you are in the mood of giving divorce to your wife, then you can do so quite easily. The wife will very rarely suit a case against her husband. If you are anxious of marrying second, third and even fourth wife, you can do so quite easily and without any fear. No sooner will you desire for marrying yourself, then there will be many relations for you, so much so that it will be very difficult for you to select a suitable wife for you. My friends, it was really our obedience to our Islamic culture that we did not bring a foreign lady from America".

8th Candidate. In Islam a woman cannot divorce a husband. It is husband who is allowed to divorce her wife. A man can divorce her wife only on the grounds of her immorality in sexual matters. There are many *Ayat* (verses) in the Quran which speak about the divorce of the woman. These occur in the Quran in these words

2 : 223—233 "Your wives are a tilth for you, so approach your tilth when and how you like and send ahead some good for yourselves . and fear Allah and know that you shall meet Him ; and convey good tidings to those who obey. And do not make Allah a target for your oaths that you may thereby abstain from doing good and acting righteously and making peace between mankind. And Allah is All-Knower, All-Hearer. Allah will not call you to account for such of your oaths as are vain, but He will call you to account what your hearts have earned. And Allah is Most Forgiving, Forbearning. For those who vow abstinance from their

wives, the maximum period of waiting is four months, then if they go back from the vow, surely, Allah is Most Forgiver, Most Merciful.

"And if they decide upon *divorce*, then, surely, Allah is All-Hearer, All-Knower. And the divorced woman shall wait concerning themselves for three courses ; and it is not lawful for them that they conceal what Allah has created in their wombs, if they believe in Allah and the Last Day : and

their husbands have the greatest right to take them back during that period, provided they desire reconciliation. And they (the women) have right similar to those (of men) over them in equity ; but men have a rank above them. And Allah is Mighty, Wise. Such divorce may be pronounced twice, then, either retain them in a becoming manner or send them away with kindness. And it is not lawful for you that you take anything of what you have given them (your wives) unless both fear that you cannot observe the limits prescribed by Allah, then it shall be no sin for either of them in what she gives to get her freedom. These are the limits prescribed by Allah, so do not transgress them ; and whoever transgresses the limits prescribed by Allah, it is they that are the wrongdoers. And if he divorces her the third time, then she is not lawful for him, thereafter, until she marries another husband ; and, if he also divorces her, then it shall be no sin for them to return to each other, provided they are sure that they would be to able observe the limits prescribed by Allah. And these are the limits prescribed by Allah which He makes clear to the people who have knowledge. And when you divorce your wives and they approach the end of their appointed period, then either retain them in a becoming manner ; or send them away in a becoming manner, but do not retain them wrongfully so that you may transgress his own soul. And do not make a jest of the commandments of Allah, and remember the favours of Allah upon you and the Book and the wisdom which He has sent down to you, whereby He exhorts you. And fear Allah and know that Allah knows all the things well. And when you divorce women and they reach the end of their period, then do not prevent them from marrying their husbands, if they agree between themselves in a decent manner. This is an admonition for him among you (O mankind) who believe in Allah and the Last Day. It is more blessed for you and purer ; and Allah knows but you do not know. And mothers shall suck their children for two whole years ; this is for those who desire to complete the suckling. And the man to whom the child belongs shall be responsible for their (mother's) food and clothing according to usage. No soul is burdened beyond its capacity. The mother shall not make the father suffer on account of her child, nor shall he to whom the child belongs make the mother suffer on account of his child

their husbands have the greatest right to take them back during that period, provided they desire reconciliation. And they (the women) have right similar to those (of men) over them in equity ; but men have a rank above them. And Allah is Mighty, Wise. Such divorce may be pronounced twice, then, either retain them in a becoming manner or send them away with kindness. And it is not lawful for you that you take anything of what you have given them (your wives) unless both fear that you cannot observe the limits prescribed by Allah, then it shall be no sin for either of them in what she gives to get her freedom. These are the limits prescribed by Allah, so do not transgress them ; and whoever transgresses the limits prescribed by Allah, it is they that are the wrongdoers. And if he divorces her the third time, then she is not lawful for him, thereafter, until she marries another husband ; and, if he also divorces her, then it shall be no sin for them to return to each other, provided they are sure that they would be to able observe the limits prescribed by Allah. And these are the limits prescribed by Allah which He makes clear to the people who have knowledge. And when you divorce your wives and they approach the end of their appointed period, then either retain them in a becoming manner ; or send them away in a becoming manner. but do not retain them wrongfully so that you may transgress his own soul. And do not make a jest of the commandments of Allah, and remember the favours of Allah upon you and the Book and the wisdom which He has sent down to you, whereby He exhorts you. And fear Allah and know that Allah knows all the things well. And when you divorce women and they reach the end of their period, then do not prevent them from marrying their husbands, if they agree between themselves in a decent manner. This is an admonition for him among you (O mankind) who believe in Allah and the Last Day. It is more blessed for you and purer ; and Allah knows but you do not know. And mothers shall suck their children for two whole years ; this is for those who desire to complete the suckling. And the man to whom the child belongs shall be responsible for their (mother's) food and clothing according to usage. No soul is burdened beyond its capacity. The mother shall not make the father suffer on account of her child, nor shall he to whom the child belongs make the mother suffer on account of his child, and the same is incumbent upon the heir. If they both decide upon weaning the child by mutual consent and con-

sultation, there is no blame on them. And if you desire to engage a wet-nurse for your children, there shall be no blame on you, provided you pay what you have agreed to pay, in a fair manner. And fear Allah and know that Allah sees what you do."

33 : 49 "O Muslims, when you marry believing women and then divorce them before you have touched them, and then you have no right against them with regard to the period of waiting that you reckon. So make some provision for them and send them away in a handsome manner."

65 : 1—7 "O Prophet ! when you divorce woman, divorce them for the prescribed period, and reckon the period ; and fear Allah. Do not turn them out of their houses, nor should they themselves leave unless they commit an act which is manifestly foul. And these are the limits set by Allah ; and whosoever transgresses the limits of Allah, he, indeed, wrongs his own soul. You do not know ; it may be that thereafter Allah will bring something new to pass. Then when they are about to reach their prescribed term, keep them with kindness, or put them away with kindness, and call to witness two just men from among you, and bear true witness for Allah. This is by which is admonished he who believes in Allah and the Last Day. And he who fears Allah, He will make for him a way. And He will provide for him from where he does not expect. And he who puts his trust on Allah, He is sufficient for him. Verily, Allah will accomplish His purpose. Allah has appointed a measure for everything. And if you are in doubt as to such of your women as despair of monthly courses, then know that the prescribed period for them is three months, and the same is for such who have not had their monthly courses yet. And as for those who are with child, their period shall be until they are delivered of their burden. And whoever fears Allah, He will provide facilities for him in his affair. That is the command of Allah which He has revealed to you. And whoever fears Allah - He will remove the evil consequences of his deeds and will enlarge his reward. Lodge them during the prescribed period in the houses wherein you dwell, according to the best of your means ; and do not harass them so that you may create hardships for them. And if they be with child, then spend on them until they are delivered of their burden. And if they give suck to the child for you, then give them their recompense, and consult with one another in kindness, but if you meet with difficulty from each other, then another woman shall suck the child for him (the father). Let him who has abundance of means spend out his abundance. And let him whose means of subsistence are strained spend out of what Allah has given him. Allah does not burden any soul beyond that which He has given it. Allah will soon bring about ease after hardship."

The Islamic laws of divorce establish peace in lives of men and women. Our friends were quoting the words of Ata-ul-Haq Qasmi for the peaceful life which the Muslim husbands and wives spend in Pakistan. Similar is the case with all the other Muslims of the world. I strongly recommend that men and women should not have equal rights of divorce.

Group Discussion No. 28

Topic :

"THE MORE ONE READS, THE MORE FOOLISH ONE BECOMES"

(C.S.S. 1970)

1st candidate : The words appear to have been snatched right out of the mouth of a country boor who covers up his own lack of education with a sneering contempt for all book learning. Or is it just one of those inane wisecracks habitually made by people who are always trying to say something clever ? Whatever the origin of the saying, we should have no difficulty in dismissing it with the contempt which all such gems of thought deserve. Ever since the art of writing was invented, reading has been recognised as a necessary adjunct of culture. There is hardly anything in the world to take the place of the stimulating and inspiring effect of contact with great minds which reading affords. There is hardly any human activity which can serve to breaden our sympathies and enlighten our understanding as reading can. As Addision has said, "Reading is to the mind what exercise is to the body". I would go enven so far as to say that it is to the mind what food is to the body. In order to enjoy good physical health, we provide our body with wholesome and nourishing food. In order to develop and have the full use of our mental faculties, it is equally necessary that we should cultivate our minds with the best food for thought which is available to us through good reading. It is the gateway to a whole world of thought and imagination. In the realm of books, we have but tc have the inclination and we can have access to "every species of wisdom to judge and power to perform". Even if we turn to reading more for relaxation than for instruction it is the most innocent way of relaxing and indoubtedly the most profitable because if nothing else reading can help us towards of boredom and enjoy hours of delight at very little cost.

God forbid that we should allow ourselves to be taken in by people who think in the manner suggested in the proposition put to us. That would amount to barring our minds against the treasure-house of thought and knowledge built by numberless saints and sages who, through the ages, have immeasurably enriched human heritage

by their quest. I have no doubt that all friends here today will reject out of hand as absurd the hypothesis we have been called upon to discuss.

2nd candidate : I would be the last person indeed to do anything to deprive my learned friends, Mr. No. I of the innocent delight he finds in books. But however eloquent he may wax in praise

of reading he cannot hope to convert me because in my time, I have seen many a promising youth who through a surfeit of reading, have brought on themselves physical ruination and mental dyspepsia. Many times my heart has bled to see rosy-cheeked children with sparkling eyes robbed of their innocent laughter and turned into morse, blinking owls looking at the world from behind thick glasseis all through reading too many books.

Wouldn't it make for a more cheerful and pleasant world if we had a little more of good cheer and health and a little less of learning ? And yet the evidently deleterious effect which addiction to books has on people's health is only part of the story. The vice has a crippling effect on the mind as well. I can see my well read predecessor wincing at what must sound to his cultured ear like a brazen blasphemy. But there is no escape from reality something which generally eludes the bookwise fraternity. One of the strongest urges which leads man to the book-self is mental inertia, because there is hardly a more ingenious device for avoiding thought than the reading of books. And as we become more and more addicted to it, we lose the inclination—nay even the capacity for original thinking ; the weight of books we carry in our heads our brain immobile and cluttered up which odds and ends hardly worth knowing. The burning candle of natural curiosity is first dimmed and then extinguished and we become dull and senseless. In the course of his learned discourse on the virtues of reading, Mr. No. I just now offered a prayer breeching God to protect us from being taken in by those whose estimate of the value of book-reading deffers from his. He has expressed a horror of what he has referred to as 'barring our minds against treasure-houses of thought and knowledge. As he is a well-read man, I presume he might have come across this famous verse of Wordsworth :

On impulse from a vernal
wood
May teach you. more of man,
of moral, evil and of good
Then all the sages can.

He may be sure that "one impulse from a vernal wood", would not only serve to uplift his soul, but also sharpen his mental faculties and improve his health something that cannot be accomplished through reading. The proposition put before us embodies a profound truth which we shall ignore at our own peril. I have no hesitation in endorsing it with all my heart.

3rd candidate : Even though I do not agree with all that Mr. No. 2 has said, let me at once acknowledge that there is considerable truth in some of what he has said. Addiction to reading can no doubt lead to deterioration in health and mental dyspepsia. But then addiction to anything will be equally disastrous. Excess has to be avoided everywhere. The disastrous results so graphically described by my friend are to follow if we read on without thinking. But if we think over and digest what we read, the exercise is bound to give health and vigour to our minds. Another danger which my friend has pointed out is that reading becomes a means of avoiding thought and then result in atrophying the mind. This too is not inevitable.

It depends upon to reader whether he unquestioningly accepts what he reads or subjects it to the test of thinking. Reading without thinking would naturally make us learned without sense, and have a bad effect on our sensibility. A sense of discrimination is more important in reading than anywhere else. As Bacon has said : "Some books are to tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested, that is some books are to be read only in parts, others to be read but not seriously and some few to be read wholly and with diligence and attention". What and how we read it is the most material point to be considered when setting out to find what effect reading has on our minds. The proposition we are discussing is no more than a vague generalisation—at best a half-truth which it would be dangerous to accept as gospel. Let us therefore reject it by all means.

4th candidate : Mr. No. 3 has suggested moderation and discrimination in reading. While exhorting us to reject the proposition he has also sounded a warning against reading in excess. But doesn't the proposition we are discussing say the same thing. "The more we read the more foolish we become." It does not say reading produces folly. No. Far from that. It permits reading but only in moderation to the extent that the pastime does not turn one's head. I am therefore inclined to believe that even though unwittingly, Mr. No. 3 has upheld rather than rejected the thought embodied on the proposition. Even otherwise there is ample evidence to prove that the adage is basically true. How do my friends on the opposite side explain that to get their degrees and doctorates, our scholars have to deep into the literary outpourings of people who most probably had no formal schooling. From Kalidas to Shakespeare any number of examples can be cited. None of those worthies may be found fit for a school master's job today but the products of their minds will always be admired and praised. I have strong doubts whether they could have done equally well had some schoolmaster succeeded in cluttering up their minds with the usual abra-cadabra. Likewise great inventors were very often unlettered people. It is therefore very difficult to uphold that reading necessarily improves the mind. The converse however appears to be nearer the truth. I would, therefore, gladly endorse the proposition.

5th candidate : I must say the argument Mr. No. 4 has just now adduced in favour of his thesis is rather misleading. It is a mistake to bring in the great of all time while we are discussing the rctions and reactions of ordinary minds. The people my friend has mentioned were geniuses-and geniuses have always defied comparison because each one of them being specially gifted is a law unto himself and a source of inspitation and guidance for generations to come. The adage we are discussing has no relevance in their case. Looking at it from the point of view of the common run of people we may concede that it holds some water if it is mean to be a warning against becoming book-worms and closing our minds in the process but it is certainly a product of perverted thinking if it is taken to mean a wholesale condemnation of reading.

However, fertile a mind may be, it cannot be rendered productive unless it is cultivated with good reading-more for the sake of stimulating it to bring out its best than for loading it with facts. As my friends Mr. No. 1 just now said, the proposition before us is no more than an inane wisecrack and it would be mistake to take it seriously

Group Discussion No. 29

Topic :

MAN IS RETURNING TO TRIBALISM

(C.S.S. 1969)

1st candidate : This is the age of the super-powers. We can assert without fear of contradiction that their emergence has had a powerful impact, not only on the comparatively smaller nation states, but also on the history of the entire human race. The fantastic progress they have achieved in science and technology, the immense potential they have built for destruction and the mastrey they have acquired over the skies the vastnesses of space and the murky depths of the oceans have had a sobering effect on men everywhere. Today more than ever we realize that it is after all a small world in which we are living. It has also become clear as daylight the whole human race shares a common destiny. We have to sink or swim together. A flip of the finger on the triggers in Moscow or Washington can turn the good earth into a charred wasteland in a jiffy. In these circumstances is not it meaningless to talk of a return to tribalism ? In the march of history, man has left tribalism far behind. What was tribalism ? In essence it was a manifestation of the herd instinct a product of the primitive man's fears, the fear of the unknown, the fear of other tribes etc. With the gradual evolution of a closer-knit human society, such fears naturally become antiquated and out dated. Tribalism is a relic of the past, long since as. It is true that we are yet far from being able to claim that the earth has witnessed the establishment of true brotherhood of man but we have certainly come a long way

from our tribalistic past, not only in our minds and hearts but in externals as well. With the passage of time sartorial styles, social mores and even food habits are becoming more and more universalised all over the civilized world. Today we can roam about all over the globe and feel at home everywhere. Could it be so in the age of tribalism? I fail to see any validity in the doubt expressed in the preposition placed before us. I am sure all of us here will agree that there is no basis for such apprehensions. The only answer we can make here is "Certainly not. Man is not returning to tribalism. On the other hand, every day that dawn brings us near to the universal man."

2nd candidate : I am afraid my friend, Mr. No. 1 has not been able to understand the purport of the proposition. Or, if he has understood it he has failed to look at it dispassionately. I presume everybody, at least every civilized person would like to see the brotherhood of man established on earth. But while considering whether we are moving towards our goal or going away from it we must adopt a dispassionate view. It appears my able predecessor has allowed the wish to become father to the thought, and this has led him astray. I wish to be allowed to submit that tribalism which is the subject of the proposition before us, is an instinct ingrained in human nature. It is true that with our pretensions to and professions of civilization, today we feel reluctant, even ashamed, to confess that a streak of tribalism persists in us. Nonetheless it is there, and not very much concealed either. My predecessor just now said that sartorial styles and social meres are being universalized.

Look at the way the youngsters of today are clothed. They have abandoned dress in favour of costumes which are tribal in style and character. Look at the new suits, which are taking birth everyday, *e.g.*, the mods and rockers, the hippies the skinheads etc. Each one of these has been more exotic than the other. Our friend has also been talking of a common destiny for mankind. We do not see much evidence of it or do we ? On the other hand, any number of instances can be cited to show that tribal instincts continue to play a powerful role in human thinking and actions. In almost every country in the world we can find regional and racial separatism rearing its head. The Kurds in Iran, the Maoris in New-Zealand the black Americans in America, Welsh men in England, the Basques in Spain, so on and so forth. This is evidence enough if evidence be needed of the fact that thousands of years of civilizing notwithstanding man has not yet been able to discard the legacy of tribalism a state in which our ancestors are said to have lived for a million years. Deep inside he continues to be the primitive tribesman happiest when he is among people with whom he has bounds of kinship stronger than any forged by the modern nation-state. There is thus hardly any question of his returning to tribalism. He never renounced it.

-**3rd candidate** : I heartily agree with my friends Mr. No. 2 when he says that man still retains a dash of tribalism in his nature. But to

say that, that is the only primitive instinct traces of which can yet be found in his mental make-up would be tantamount to losing sight of the woods for the trees. If he has not renounced tribalism, he has neither been bale to overcome or eliminate altogether the streaks of savagery and barbarism inherent in him. We can surely say that man essentially remains a primitive but all the same time we cannot entirely ignore the impact which thousands of years of civilizing have had in taming and even atrophying these instincts to a great extent.. Almost the whole world today is ruled by civilized governments and the laws made by them and not by tribal chiefs, guarding ancients customs and traditions. The last strong citadel of tribalism was darkest Africa. As long as it was under foreign rule the foreign masters encouraged tribalism as a useful prop for their regimes. But with the dawn of freedom, tribal chiefs have been replaced by freedom fighters who had waged and led struggles against foreign domination. The congeries of tribes have been replaced by new nation-states. My predecessor has referred to the phenomenon of racial separatism rearing its head in a number of countries. But he is sadly mistaken in interpreting as a revival of tribalism what is in fact the last stand of decarying institution. Change is the law of nature and life but in every sphere and always it has to contend against decadent revivalism. Tribalism is definitely on the way out, without any conscious effort being made to eradicate it. It is gradually being snuffed out by the evolution of the nation state and the vast impersonal complex communities which are coming up in the form of a growing number of big cities. It is patently wrong to say that man is returning to tribalism.

4th candidate : Friends, it is amazing to what extent we can delude ourselves. There must be billions of people who, like our friend, Mr. No. 3 honestly believe that humanity has been really progressing in civilization and leaving its primitive past behind. But before we accept that as the truth I would suggest that we examine men's attitude towards the end-product of this civilization *i.e.* modern society and also see how modern society looks at itself. Our friend Mr. No. 3 was just now saying that the impersonal communities coming into existence in big cities are helping to smother the tribal instinct. Obviously he has no idea of the tremendous backlash of unhappiness and discontentment which growing unbanization has been producing. Man is more and more oppressed by the increasing complexities of city life which give him the feeling of being caged in compelling his thoughts a more and more towards the natural tribal state in which he lived in harmony with nature and felt much happier. The result is that we are seeing more and more people turning their back on society and coming under the spell of exotic pseude-spiritual sects. Almost without exception those drop-outs opt for tribal styles of dress and living. One the social plane prophets of the modern age like Herbert Marcuse and Marshal McLuhan have pronounced against the closed technological society of today and warned young people against allowing themselves to be absorbed The spiritual sickness which modern civilization has produced has made man yearn for the good old days of his primitive past. Those who are not sufficiently aware of the ferment in society can find

ample evidence of man's unmistakable return to tribalism in the contemporary international political scene. What is *apartheid*, but blatant tribalism. What is the state of Israel but territory gained by members of a tribe binding together ? What is the significance of the almost continuous communal rioting in Pakistan, Ireland and other countries ? What is at the back of the row over immigrants in the U.K. ? Is not all this enough to convince anybody that man is returning to tribalism ?

5th candidate : I am sure all of us will fully endorse the viewpoint expressed by our friend Mr. No. 4. The arguments he has advanced in support of his stand are unexceptionable. His treatment of the subject has been fairly exhaustive and he has touched upon the individual the social and the political manifestations of tribalism in contemporary life. Mr. No. 2 may however yet join issue with him because the formerh as maintained that the question of man's returning to tribalism does not arise because in fact he never renounced it. Mr. No. 3, however sought to establish that man is returning to tribalism. The seeming inconsistency between the two stand points can homever be reconciled if we understand that just like fashion cycles in women's clothes and business cycles in enconomics there are thought and ideology cycles which activate men's minds differently at different periods in history, creating illusions of change and progress while as a matter of a fact we are going round in circles all the time. The annals of man bear witness to this. From primitive savagery man has gone on to tribalism (the age of conquests) to nationalism (world wars) and even to internationalism (UNO).

He may now well be on his way back and may one day be from where he started. The change will be hastened by a nuclear holocaust which is very much on the cards. Coming events do cast their shadows before and the profound change we are witnessing in man's attitude towards society may well be the harbingers of another swing of the pendulum. Which is reviving the primitive impulses are once again coming to the forewith added vehemence all over the world, and threatening to destroy the fabric of the nation-state. Instead of advancing from nationalism, man appears to be relapsing into clannishness. In view of all this we should have no hesitation endoresing the preposition before us viz., that man is returning to tribalism.

Group Discussion No. 30

Topic :

NATIONALISM IS OBSOLETE TODAY

(*C.S.S. 1970*)

1st candidate : The development of communications and fast means of travel in the present century has served to bring men closer together as they had never been before. With the aid of scientific and technolgoical progress, man has come a long way from times when people on one side of the globe had no idea of what might be happening on the other side. Today news of a significant event in the most obscure corner is flashed all over the world in a few seconds, and

can cause universal concern. Closer contacts between nations have also led to the expansion and complementary development of trade and industry so that the progress and prosperity of mankind as whole has become indivisible and the whole world has become one economic unit. In this context naturally enough nationalism has been rendered obsolete as a basis of political organization In recent years the emergence of international organizations of workers, traders and industrialists, financiers, statesmen etc. provides clear proof that nationalism is on the way out. Till recently it had been national rivalries which caused most of the conflicts. Today the struggle is between ideologies and whichever, ideology triumphs whether it is communism, socialism, or capitalism or even if the adherents of two or more of them decide to co-exist it is bound to lead to the establishment of a world order in which nations will pay the same role as districts and provinces play in relation to a state. Nationalism is obsolete today.

2nd candidate : We have to admit that development of transport and communications has made ours a small world and brought nations into closer touch with each other but has all this really weakened the spirit of nationalism ? That such is not the case will be evident if we go into the causes of the conflicts that are raging today. What is at the back of the Sino-Soviet conflict except national rivalries ?. To uphold which ideology are the Arabs and the Jews fighting against each other in West Asia ?. My able friend, Mr. No. 1 has pointed to the recent formation of various international organizations as providing proof that nationalism is on the wane. But he forgets that these organizations have as members sovereign states and could not exist otherwise. And these sovereign states are there not to promote each other's interests but to protect their own. In fact nationalism provides a very strong basis for political organization A nation is a unit having the largest measure of economic viability as a unit, cultural unity and social homogeneity. It is something very real a fundamental fact. Man is by nature clannish and whatever the advocates of one world might preach or practice, national rivalries and division will persist. There are no signs yet of the millenium visualised by my friend. Nationalism is very much a living force and it will continue to inspire men for a long time to come. Those who say it has become obsolete deceive themselves and nobody else.

3rd candidate : Mr. No. 2 is right when he says that nationalism has a strong basis as a system of political organization. But he forgets that human society and system of organization are all the time undergoing change. It took men some time to organize themselves into nations and nation-states have existed for some time now. It cannot be denied that they fulfilled a definite need a definite function. But the process of evolution of human society is certainly not going to stop there. The nation-state is not eternal. It may be true that man retains his clannish mentality and leans towards separatism rather than association. But if nothing else the common danger which humanity faces today is bound to bring the nations together. For more than two decades now great powers have been spending astronomical sums of money on developing means enough to destroy the earth

many times over. But they have not been able to make any use of those engines of destruction. Why ? Because they know that the whole world would be up as one against whoever is foolish enough to take the initiative. In their hearts statemen everywhere realise that human civilization can be saved from being annihilated only through system of world organization which transcends national barriers.

It is time when men had given up the "my country, right or wrong" attitude and started thinking in terms of humanity as a whole. If they go on thinking along the narrow grooves of regionalism, and national differences they may not be deceiving anybody, but they will certainly be working for their own doom.

4th candidate : My predecessor's impassioned discourse was very inspiring indeed, and for a time I was carried away by the lofty sentiments expressed by him. But then, I think he has gone considerably off the mark. The proposition before us is "Nationalism is Obsolete Today". Cosmopolitanism or even internationlism may be a very noble ideal, but I understand instead of extolling the virtues of these ideals we are expected here to consider whether and how far nationalism is relevant in the contemporary context. Looking at the contemporary world scene, how do we see nations reacting to each other. To say the least they are more often than not mistrustful of each other. Even nations swearing by the same ideology or similar ideologies have no love lost for each other. See what the Soviet Union did to Czechoslovakia, what India has done to Pakistan ; the state of relations between Russia and China between Iran and Iraq. From all this it is more than evident that in the present-day world national rivalries are the order of the day. I, therefore, doubt whether the arguments advanced by my friend, Mr. No. 1 that the world is now divided by ideological cleavages and not by national boundaries has any vilidity. The fact that several types of international groupings have come into existence does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the world is moving away from nationalism. As a matter of fact interests, we do not know what the future holds but for the present nationalism is a vital living force and it cannot by any stretch of imagination be described as obsolete.

5th candidate : Before I express my views on the subject I must say that Mr. No. 4 is wrong in presuming that we are to limit ourselves to saying what is and not express ourselves on what should be. As I see that the proposition before us is an invitation to tough. More than pronouncing on the present state of nationalism we have to see whether it retains its usefulness and validity in the prevailing world situation. Therefore, I am sure we would not be guilty of digressing too much if we touch upon the greater contemporary relavance of internationlism as compared to nationalism today. It is to be admitted that nationalism has been the dominating creed for several hundred years now. But how and how far has it benefitted mankind? It was nationalism which brought the world to the brink of disaster twice in the first half of the present century. The coming into existence of the United Nations Organization after World War II was the nations second attempt to come together, save themselves from the excesses of nationalism. The first attempt the League of Nations had failed because the perils of militant nationalism had not been sufficiently

visualised and it was again allowed to raise its head in the twenties and thirties. But World War II and especially the dropping of atom bombs on two Japanese cities brought a forceful realization that nationalism had become obsolete and that the foundations of peace could be laid on international co-operation only. Ever since the world has been moving in that direction, there is more international co-operation evident today than at any time in the past.

Group Discussion No. 31

Topic :

ARE HEART TRANSPLANTS IN THE HUMAN BODY DESIRABLE?

(*C.S.S. 1968*)

1st candidate : Eversince Dr. Christian Barnard placed a woman's heart in Louis Washkansky's frame in December 1967, the transplant of human organs has become a rage. According to newspaper reports, upto the middle of July, 1968, there had been no less than twenty-five cases of human heart-transplantations in all corners of the globe, not to speak of innumerable transplantations of other human organs like the liver, the lungs, the kidney etc. All these cases have been extensively reported in the press. No doubt the skill achieved by man in transplanting organs from one body to another is miraculous but is it really a sign of progress? Imagine a person whose body has suffered from the ravages of time so much, that it is no longer a fit abode for his soul. For such a person, death would mean merciful deliverance. Is it not foolish on the part of such a person as also on the part of his doctor to help the former to prolong his life artificially by the transplantation of a vital organ Will it not amount to denying divine mercy and defying the will of God? Even if such person gains a few more days to spend on this earth, will he be able to live in peace? Will he not always be haunted by fears of a sudden end? Won't he be constantly suffering from sense of guilt for having heated death out of its due? I am sure it would be best for such a person to make his peace with the world and depart when his time comes instead of suffering his agony to be prolonged. I salute the professional skill of the transplant surgeons as they have come to be known, but I do not feel that their proficiency adds to the sum-total of human happiness and is, therefore, something to be cherished.

2nd candidate : The transplant of a vital organ in the type of case described by my friend Mr. No. 1 would of course be something undesirable Transplant operations of the type we are discussing are certainly not desirable in all cases. As against the case cited by my friend, I too can build up as equally convincing argument around a young and promissing person who can be saved with a timely trans-

plant to lead a life useful to his family, his community and his country. If it is possible to save such a person, I am sure even my able predecessor would not like that he should be allowed to die. As can be said of any other scientific advance, there is nothing wrong with transplant surgery as such. But like any other scientific discovery, this one too can be abused. There can be mistakes in determining the death of the donor. There can be mistakes in the choice of recipients, or in allotting priority to them ? But it is possible to devise fool-proof checks to guard against such mistakes. In the middle of July 1968, and conference of heart transplant surgeons was held in Cape Town to tackle these very problems. These can be and will be overcome in course of time. But there is no good reason why the fruits of pains-taking research should be discarded merely because they can be misused. We have not banned the study of physics because it has led to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. We have not stopped using ropes because people have been known to have used them for hanging others or even themselves. Similarly we need not condemn replacement of diseased organs in the human body. Instead, we should try to make sure that the surgeons exercise due discrimination in determining the desirability or otherwise of a transplant in each individual case. Let us not try to lay down the law in this matter.

3rd candidate : I am afraid my able friend, Mr. No. 2 has fallen into the same error which he attributed to Mr. No. 1. How many cases of the type he has mentioned do occur in the world, and how many of them reach experienced doctors ? Judging from the number of persons who can really benefit from transplant surgery, and the huge cost involved, it is really something of dubious merit. If we pause and ponder over the direction transplant surgery is taking, we shall indeed be horrified. There are plans to extend its sphere to cover all human organs from the brain downwards. There are plans to establish banks of human organs. There are plans to plant organs of animals in the human body. Just imagine being accosted on the road by a thoroughly doctored person with a set of borrowed physiological equipment *i e.*, the heart of one, the brain of another and the liver of yet another. How shall we identify such a synthetic person ? Shall we be able to say that he has a personality of his own ? Then there is yet another danger to which progress in transplant surgery can give rise. Now a poor man who has no material possession can go about unmolested because he has nothing of value and even the robbers would spare him. But once the transplanting of human orggans becomes standard practice, stealing vital organs from un-suspecting strangers and selling them in the blackmarket may also be added to the list of crimes in which humanity indulges. In view of these and other apprehensions I do not find it in my heart to lend support to the cult of transplant surgery.

4th candidate : I am indeed horrified to hear my predecessor's recital of possibilities inherent in the progress of transplant surgery. But I have half a doubt that he was speaking with his tongue in the cheek. I just cannot believe that the apprehensions he has expressed about a criminal tribe to organ-snatchers coming into being with the

advance of transplant surgery techniques were seriously meant. Similarly, meeting a synthetic man is a fascinating possibility in the realm of fantasy. These things have failed to make his denunciation of transplant surgery convincing. In any case, it requires a high conception of the value of human life to appreciate the blessing that transplant surgery is going to be for mankind. Developments in this sphere

have brought new glory to medical research and given medical men a much better idea than they had hithertofore of the functioning of vital human organs, so that they are now in a better position to prevent fatality. Thanks to the techniques developed by transplant surgeons, persons with congenital malfunctioning of organs or young persons whose bodies develop functional disorders early in life may no longer look upon themselves as under the sentence of death. A donor can, before he departs this world, make the priceless gift of a new life to some handicapped or diseased fellow human being through the transplant surgeons—those men with the golden touch. Those who are apprehensive that the new techniques will lend themselves to abuse must retrieve their faith in the essential goodness of human nature. The progress made by transplant surgery is a glorious chapter in the saga of mankind. In belittling and denigrating it, we belittle and denigrate ourselves.

5th candidate : One of the criteria by which we can determine whether transplant surgery is desirable or has reached the stage where it can gain universal acceptance is the rate of survival. Out of 25 human heart transplants during the last seven months of 1968, only eight patients are reported to be surviving. That shows that medical science has yet to go a long way before it can commend transplant surgery with some surety. In its present state, it will not be far wrong to say that it is in an experimental stage. As has been pointed out by Russian doctors, these experiments are certainly premature. Experimental transplant operations have been carried out for long on animals, and medical men have yet to solve the problem of rejection. The science of immunology has not yet been developed to the extent where a surgeon can say with certainty that the organ put into his patient will be accepted. In this experimental stage, boldness is no doubt laudable but the surgeon may not be bold at the patient's expense. He can, if necessary, experiment on his own self for the sake of science but not on the patient. Dr. Barnard has no doubt tried to blaze a new trail but he appears to have been in too much of a hurry to do it. Let us even concede that the surgeon richly deserves all the encomiums showered on him. But the way his work has been played up in the press, and the way he has gone about it does not exactly accord with the ways of scientific research. He might have waited till the science of immunology had found a sure answer to the problem of rejection. Till the techniques have been perfected to a reasonable degree, transplant surgery on human beings is certainly not desirable.

6th candidate : I am not sure whether what we heard just now was a condemnation of transplant surgery or an indictment of Dr. Barnard for gate-crashing into it. Anyhow, it appears my friend does not object to transplant operations on principle. What he objects to is that human beings should be used as guinea-pigs for experimentation. Very laudable sentiment indeed ! But that is not the point at issue. We have been asked to express ourselves on whether transplants in the human body are desirable. We can hope to answer the question satisfactorily only after we have studied it from all possible angles, *e.g.*, its medico-legal aspect, its ethical aspect, its social aspect etc. Looking at it from the medico-legal point of view, there is nothing wrong with a transplant operation as long as the following conditions are satisfied : Firstly that the donor or, if he is physically unable to signify consent, his nearest relations consent to the removal of the required organ from the body immediately death occurs ; secondly that before the organ is detached, the doctors are sure of the donor's clinical death ; thirdly that the recipient has given his consent. From the ethical point of view, we have heard an objection that it is an attempt to defy the will of God. But I say whatever means we adopt, can we do that ? In any case what do we know of the will of God ? Most of us are accustomed to use the expression only when we come up against something we cannot help. I say it is the will of God that Philip Blaiberg should walk about with another person's heart beating in his chest ? In what manner will anyone prove that what I say is wrong ? The objection cannot therefore be regarded as valid. In regard to the social aspect, it has been said that 'synthetic man' can hardly be said to have a personality of his own. There is no possibility of a synthetic man walking to this earth in the near future. So far, we know only of person having one transplanted organ. The fear of a change in personality has been expressed only in the cases of those who have received new hearts. But such fears are imaginary. They arise from the mistaken belief that the heart is the centre of emotions. Actually, it is nothing of that sort. It is nothing but an 'admirable pump', the replacement of which can hardly bring about any change in the personality of the recipient. Thus we see that most of the objections raised here by the critics of transplant surgery are without substance. In view of this, I am sure all of us will answer the question with a 'yes'.

Group Discussion No. 32

WHO CAN RUN THE GOVERNMENT BETTER— MEN OR WOMEN ?

1st Candidate. The G.T.O. Sir, and friends ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

Allah has created the heavens, the earth, the sun, the moon, the stars, man and everything in the worlds and have affixed their functions. He has created man and woman with their best physical and mental make. He has allotted different functions for man and woman. Man is endowed with administrative powers to run home and other affairs. Woman has been created for nursing her children and for performing other minor household affairs. The physical structurs of man and woman are quite different from each other. The mental structures of men and women are also quite distinct from each other. Man and woman have been created to perform different duties. From this elaboration, it is quite obvious that a man can run a Government in a far better way than a woman.

2nd Candidate. Allah establishes a fact in the Quran that a man has got dominant power over a woman. Being weak in both physical and mental powers, a woman is not altogether in a position to govern her superior authority – man. The fact that man is a dominance power over woman is confirmed by the Quran 4 : 34 in these words :

> "Men are guardians over women because Allah has made some of them excel others, and because they (men) spend of their wealth. So virtuous women are those who are obedient, and who in the absence of their husbands, with Allah's protection, safeguard their chastity. And for those on whose part you fear disobedience, admonish them and leave them alone in their beds, and beat them. Then, if they obey you, then do not seek a way against them. Surely, Allah is High, Great".

Thus, again superiority of man over woman is proved. It distinctly shows that men can run Government in a far better way than women.

3rd Candidate. Casting a glance over world history we find that it were men who ran successful big governments and empires. In the Muslim history, we find that it were the renowned personalities like Prophets of Allah ; Ibrahim, Yusuf, Ishaque, Daud, Musa, Sulaiman, Jaloot, Isa, etc (peace be upon them all), and Muhammad (may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) who ran Islamic States in a most successful way. These blessed Muslims fought

successful battles against their own enemies and the enemies of Allah – *Kafirs* (disbelievers) and administered their Islamic States in a most successful manner. It has always been experienced that even among the Muslims, men who have been more Islamic-minded have been more successful in running their States. Allah has established this fact in the Quran that His obedient men will triumph in the world and the disbelievers will be defeated. Allah always supports truth which is Islam and always defeats falsehood which is *kufr*. Allah establishes this fact in the Quran 17 : 81 in these words : "Truth has come and falsehood has vanished away. Falsehood does, indeed, vanish away fast".

We find a reference in the Quran that a disbelieving woman was running a kingdom who was defeated by the Muslims and then she embraced Islam. This reference occurs in the Quran 27 : 23 – 44, thus :

> "I (Hudhud – a bird) found a woman (named Balqis – a Queen of Saba) ruling over them, and she has been given everything, she has a mighty throne. I found her people worshipping the sun instead of Allah ; and Satan has made their works look beautiful to them and has thus hindered them from the right way (of Islam), so they do not follow guidance. And Satan has bidden them not to worship Allah, Who brings to light that which is hidden in the heavens and the earth, and Who knows what you conceal and what you make known. Allah ! there is no God but He, the *Rabb* of the Mighty Throne. (Prophet Sulaiman peace be upon him) said : We shall see whether you have spoken the truth or whether you are one of the liars. Go with this letter of mine, and lay it before them ; then withdraw from them and see what answer they return. (The Queen Balqis) said : O you chiefs there has been delivered to me a noble letter. It is from Sulaiman and it is : In the name of Allah, the *Rahman*, the *Rahim* ; You behave proudly towards me, but come to me in submission. She said : You chiefs, give me advice in the matter that is before me, I never decide any matter until you are present with me and give me your advice. They replied : We possess power and we also possess great powers in war, but it is for you to command ; therefore, consider yourself what you will command. She said : Surely, kings, when they enter a country ruin it and turn the highest of its people into the lowest. And, thus, they will do. But I am going to send them a gift and wait to see what answer the envoys bring back ? So when (the Queen's ambassador) came to Sulaiman, he said : Do you mean to help me with your wealth ? But that which Allah has given me is far better than that which He has given you. But you rejoice in your gift. Go back to them, because we shall, surely, come to them with armies against which they will have no power, and we shall drive them out from there disgraced,

> and they will be humbled. He said : O nobles, which of you will bring me a throne for her before they come to me, submitting. A stalwart from among the Jinn said : I will bring it to you before they rise from the camp ; and. indeed, I possess power, therefore, and I am trustworthy. One who had knowledge of the Book said : I will bring it to you before your noble (messengers) return to you. And when he (Sulaiman – peace be upon him) saw it set before him, he said : This is by the grace of my *Rabb*, so that He may try me whether I am grateful or ungrateful for the good of his own soul ; but whoever is ungrateful, truly my *Rabb* is Self-Sufficient, Generous. He said : Make her throne unrecognizable to her, and let us see whether she follows the right way or whether she is one of those who do not follow the right way. And when she came, it was said : Is your throne like this ? She replied : It is as though it were the same. And we had been given knowledge before this, and we have already submitted. And that which she used to worship except Allah had stopped her from believing ; because she came of a disbelieving people. It was said to her : Enter the the palace. And when she saw it, she thought it to be a great expanse of water ; and she uncovered her shanks. (Thereupon Sulaiman) said : It is a palace paved smooth with slabs of glass. She said : My *Rabb*, I indeed, wronged my soul ; and I submit myself with Sulaiman to Allah ; the *Rabb* of the worlds".

All the above Quranic references go to prove that men can run Governments in a far better way than women.

4th Candidate. A woman lacks courage and other qualities which are necessary for running a State. A person who administers a State has to pass through many ups and downs in running a Government which a woman cannot do. She cannot remain steadfast in times of war.

5th Candidate. I agree with my friends Mr. 1st Candidate and 2nd Candidate that a woman is naturally weak and thus cannot run a Government. She is only fit for running a house and bringing up her children. The society of a woman is also with other women who are also weak.

6th Candidate. Running a Government is not an easy task. It is not like running a house and look after children. A woman who is herself weak, keeps society with other women who are also weak. Thus, they are not altogether in a position to create in themselves the valuable qualities of running a State.

7th Candidate. Please let me say that woman with their sweet temper can also run a Government. She is also intelligent. She can also understand the problems patiently and better. The Muslim women like Razia Sultana, Sultana Chand Bibi, etc. ran their States in a good way. Even at present we see that there are even women among the disbelievers who are running their Goverments in a satisfactory way. Such women include Mrs. Indra Gandhi, Prime Minister of India ; Mrs. Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel ; Queen Elezbeth II of Britain, etc. My friend, Mr. 3rd Candidate has also given us a reference of the Quran that Queen Balqis had a great kingdom. Giving due consideration to these historical facts, we can say that women are also able to run Governments.

8th Candidate My ignorant friend Mr. 7th Candidate has tried to support a false and weak case. He has also tried to belie the historical facts in a most foolish away. On hearing the sound Islamic views of which my learned friends Ist Candidate and 2nd Candidate have produced in detail, he should not have uttered such quite mean and irresponsible words. Please allow me to belie his arguments item-wise.

He has described that "a woman with a sweet temper can also run a Government". "Her sweet temper" has got some minor value only in household affairs. That temper is only fit for her husband and her children. Even when her children grow up, then her sweet temper begins to spoil them. She cannot control them and has often to take help from her husband to control even a child of more than six or seven years She has got only an uneffective talking habit and no action altogether. She is so helpless that she is not in a position even to send her own children to school or some other work without the support of her husband. This shows that she is quite nill and failure in even in controlling her minor children. Her "sweet temper" has got no value even in her own home. How such a worthless fellow is in a position to run a Government which is a most high responsible job ? My friend is very praiseworthy of the so-called "sweet temper" of the woman. But in actual life a woman is of "hard and cruel temper". She does not maintain good relations both with the relatives of her husband and with the distant relatives of her own parents. She is always quarreling with both men and women with whom she has got some acquintance. A Western woman is very hard and very cruel even upon her own husband. The Western husbands who are oppressed by their cruel wives take placards in their hands and march through bazars and streets of big cities saying "save us from our wives". There are countless husbands in America, Britain and other Western countries who have been divorced by their cruel wives There are numerous societies and Unions of husbands who have been wronged by their harsh wives. The Western women do not cook food for their husbands and for their children at their homes and thus all the members of the family have to arrange for their own food daily at different hotels. These women have disturbed the home life of the Western people. My friend, Mr. 6th Candidate can see for him-

self if the women are "sweet tempered!" or "hard and cruel tempered". We must stop to furnish more achievements of the so-called "sweet tempered" woman.

My friend have stated that a woman is intelligent. This is, again, not true. A woman is not more intelligent than a man. They are weak in their studies. The syllabi of reading of the girl students is very easy. They have not to make any competition for living in the world Therefore, their intelligence in the worldly life is not sharpened. They have to attend only household affairs and have to bring up their children which do not sharpen their minds. Their thinking power is very narrow and they cannot think about things which have got far-reaching effects.

As regards Mrs. Golda Meir, the Prime Minister of Israel, she is also bringing downfall of Israel on account of her womanish foolish policies. Instead of following an independent policy for Israel, she is puppet of America and tries to harm the Muslim cause in the Muslim Middle East. She is bringing the world at the verge of war. The Jews have been responsible for many emergence of many wars. They were also responsible for the previous wars including the First Great War and the Second Great War. The Jews who are "destroyers of the Books" and "killers of Prophets", under the leadership of their wretched woman Premier, Mrs. Golda Meir are, again, draging the world into a Third World War.

My friends, Mr. 7th Candidate has also described that "a Queen had a kingdom". By referring to her description in the Quran we find that the Queen of Saba was allowed to run the state of Saba by Allah so that He may test her and her nation if they submit to the laws of Islam. But we find that she and her people did not pay any regard for Islam and followed the footsteps of the Satan. The Queen and her people worshipped the sun instead of Allah. Finding the arrogance of the Queen and her people against Islam, the Prophet Sulaiman (may peace be upon him), commanded the Queen and her nation to submit to Allah and embrace Islam. Thereupon, she consults with her nation. Here we can note a point that the Queen was running her State with the help of men, and that the credit of running her throne is not due to her ability. She ran her State with the support of her advisers who were men. It is also clear from the Quranic description that the Queen and her disbelieving nation have to acknowledge their defeat and have to yield to Islam and the Muslims the followers of Prophet Sulaiman (may peace be upon him). It is also clear from the Quranic description that Islam and the Muslims have always to triumph in the world whereas the disbelievers have always to suffer defeat and humiliation and have to embrace Islam for their safety both in the world and the Hereafter

9th Candidate. A woman has got a lot of other Shortcomings which do not enable her to run a Government on a better way than a man. She is very narrow minded. She is superstitious. She often falls in love-affairs in an easy way. Sometime she entangles hereself

in love-marriage and then she leaves even her own parents who bring her up. When we cast a glance over women's history, we find that almost all women who happened to run the Government fell in love with their own chiefs, servants and other ordinary men and sometimes with low cast poor men and destroyed their kingdoms and states in a short while. Thus, proving that women are quite unable to run the State affairs. Thus, we can say with certainty that men can run Governments in a far better way than women. Woman's thinking capacity is quite immature. There is absence of endurance in their thinking. They cannot make any durable progressive plans. As compared with the durable matured and progressive intelligence of man, a woman is considered as quite foolish.

My friend, Mr. 7th Candidate has also furnished some historical instances where Muslim women like Razia Sultana Chand Bibi had run Governments. These women were also not so efficient in running their States as compared with the Muslim Caliphs, Presidents, Amirs, Kings etc. These Muslim Queens were very inefficient in running the affairs of their States. For running the affairs of their States, these women sometimes inclined towards this Muslim chief and at another time, they inclined toward another one. My friend has also quoted some references from the present age that the women like Mrs. Indra, Mrs. Golda Meir Elizebeth II, are running their Governments in a successful way. Here, again, my friend is misguided and he has not got true picture of facts before him. We see that these women run their Governments with the help of Parliaments which are formed of men. These men guide these women to perform their duties.

The Queen of Britain is a mere "Head" without any power. So, there is no credit for this woman in the world politics. However, it may be said that the Great British Empire has been weakened and shrinked to a great extent during her rule. It is, again, during her period that Ireland is struggling for getting separation from Britain. The Irelanders are carrying on their war of independence for a long time. A serious fighting for its secession from British is going on. Many Muslims countries of Muslim Africa are daily obtaining their independence in the reign of this woman. Britain is undergoing many other loses in the reign of this Queen. This shows that the reign of this woman has not won any credit to her country but has brought it at the verge of its whole destruction.

As regards Mrs. Indira Gandhi, she is a daughter of a well-known man, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru who has remained Prime Minister of India for more than 17 years. She is also married to a relative of late Mr. Gandhi. Being so highly connected, she must enjoy some respect which his father and Mr Gandhi had earned in their life-times for the service of the Hindu nation. She had won elections for the second turn.

By her treacherous role against the Muslims of East Pakistan and West Pakistan, she had won some credit from the Indian Hindus in her aggressive war on Pakistan of December 1971.

That was her zenith hour of honour from her Hindu nation. In the early period of 1972, she enjoyed great respect from her Hindu nation. So much so that they were prepared to make her their life-time Prime Minister. But within an year her prestige was lowered in the eyes of her nation Now nobody was prepared to take her as his life-time Premier. The circumstances had so rapidly turned against the Indin Premir, Mrs. Indra Gandhi, that her nation was not prepared even to allow her to complete her second session of Prime Ministership. The Indian Hindus had turned against her and they had blamed her that she was employing her own relatives in Government services and that she was issuing licences to her own relatives. They blamed her that she had issued many licences to her own son. The Indian people also held her responsible for misery of India. They said that she was responsible for the food shortage and high prices in their country. It is, again, her folly that she had entered into a military pact with Russia and had, thus, abandoned the non-alignment policy of her father which he had kept throughout the period of his Premiership. It was, again, her folly to dismember East Pakistan from Pakistan. By Allah's grace the Muslims of the whole world are brethren to each other. They cannot be separated on a permanent basis. The whole world is seeing the reaction of the Muslims of East Pakistan and West Pakistan against the treachery which this foolish woman had made with the Muslims of Pakistan and the Muslims of the whole world. We see that the Muslims of both wings of Pakistan are endeavouring to unite with eath other. Maulana Abdul Hameed Bhashani and his East Pakistani Muslim brethren are determined to undo the infurious policies of the traitor, Shaikh Mujib-ur-Rahman and his Indian overlords. A Bombay weekly "Comment" had also bothered about the fruitless efforts of Mrs. Indra Gandhi in disuniting the two Wings of Pakistan. It had said: "Pakistan and Bangladesh may patch up almost unostentatiously, leaving India high and dry. Blood has a reputation of being thicker than water". In a period of less than a year the people of East Pakistan had begun to hate and discourage the immoral political policies of Mrs. Indra Gandhi. The weak policies of this woman in the fields of politics, economics, social, etc., have brought disturbances in India. There is always a situation of law and order in India. There are killings of the Muslims at the hands of the Hindus. There is confiscation of their properties. They are removed from the Government services and private services. Even the Hindu nation of this Premier woman is not satisfied with her. There are agitations of these people against her Government on account of high prices in the country. Many provinces of India are agitating, and making demonstrations and disturbances to get separation from their mother land – India. The struggles for independence of these provinces have gained momentum. The constabulary of India is fighting with her army. This woman is, again, responsible for the shortage of food in India. The so-called "Bangladesh" which she has created with the help of traitor Mujib and the Russian Government has become a sore for India. India will be burnt in this very fire. The Muslims of East Pakistan have realized the follies of their traitor Mujib and Indra Gandhi very soon. The

veteran leader of the East Pakistani Muslims, Maulana Abdul Hameed Bhashani is waging a civil war in his country so as to liberate it from the clutches of this cunning and deceitful woman She had injured the interests of the whole Muslim nation of East Pakistan. Mrs. Indra Gandhi, again, on account of her foolish womanly policy has also harmed the interest of the whole Sikh nation in India. She is always rejecting the genuine demand of the Sikh nation for the establishment of an independent "Sikh State" in India. Her father, Nehru and her Hindu nation had made a promise with the Indian Sikhs at the occasion of Partition of India that they will allow the Sikhs to live in their own homeland "Khalistan". This demand was a settled thing with the Sikh nation and their leader Master Tara Singh, which was belied later on. She is rejecting the genuine demand of the Sikhs now and then, but how long can she succeed in delaying this demand? The Sikhs are making perpetual demands for the establishment of a "Sikh State" in India and one day, they will, surely, suceeed in their right aim. It is, again, on her weak womanish fear that she is always arming India and is always worried from the Muslims and the Chinese people. She has spent so much on armaments that she has brought her country at the very verge of destruction. The arms alone cannot help her. How can she create courage in the minds of her *ban ia* nation who shirk their deaths. The more she is arming her nation, the more dreadful she is from the war. Although Russia is also at her back but still she is worried about war. If even, she thinks of making aggressive wars upon her neighbouring countries, then, by Allah's grace, she and her country will be defeated and smashed. This has been her fate in her aggressive wars with the Chinese people and the Muslim people. India had waged an aggressive war upon China in 1962 but was defeated. India had also waged two aggressive wars upon Pakistan in 1965 and in 1971, but met with little success at both the times.

There are a lot of other follies of this woman, Mrs. Indra Gandhi which are harming her country. We must stop to enumerate any more. If she remains in power for sometime more, she will further weaken and ruin India. Nobody knows that she may be responsible for destroying the Hindus from India and may replace the Muslims or even some other powers in India.

10th Candidate. There is also a saying (hadith) of the Prophet Muhammad (may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) which tells the whole mankind that whenever men will make their women as their "Heads" then they will be destroyed. This hadith has always been proved by historical facts as told by my learned friend, Mr. 9th Candidate. We also witness that when a woman heads the affairs of a home, she ruins it. She will quarrel with friends and helpers of her own husband. She will make her husband and her family bankrupt by spending the earnings of her husband in unjust manners. She will entangle her husband in quarrels with others. In this way, she will destroy all the peaceful life of her husband and her own family in no time. Thus, this hadith also proves that it is man who can run a Government in a far better way than a woman.

— —

Group Discussion No 33

HAS U.N.O. SERVED ANY CONCRETE PURPOSE

1st Candidate. Gentlemen ! *Aslam-o-Alaikum.*

U.N.O. is a very useful organisation. It was established on the failure of League of Nations. It has a membership of numerous countries of the world. It has tried to serve the humanity, and it has obtained success in many fields. It has solved problems of many countries like Congo, Korea, Laos, Vietnam, West Irian, etc.

2nd Candidate. The United Nations Organisation has also succeeded, though to some extent, to ban the nuclear tests. The partial test-ban treaty is a great historical document. Thus, we can say that the U.N.O. has done a lot for promoting peace in the world.

3rd Candidate. This Organization also supplies financial help to many progressive countries of the world. There are many branches of this Organization which promote welfare of the peoples in numerous forms.

4th Candidate. My three predecessor friends have been stating some uses of the U.N.O. But they have failed to describe any concrete purpose of the U.N.O. for which it was established. If an organization fails to serve the main purpose for which it was established, then it is a complete failure. An organization may serve some minor purposes for which it was not established, but it is of no use on the whole. The U.N.O. was organised as a peace-keeping and peace-fostering organization. But she has ruthlessly failed in it. It has not been able to keep peace in the world. The war is going on in different parts of the world. The war is going on in Cambodia, Laos, etc.

5th Candidate. The U.N.O. has not been able to settle the issues of Kashmir, Berlin, Cyprus, Philippines, Junagarh, Hyderabad, etc.

6th Candidate. India had made an aggressive war on Pakistan in December 1971 and dismembered East Pakistan. The U.N.O. has not taken any action. In her aggressive war with the Muslims of the Middle East, Israel with the support of America had captured many lands of the Muslim in 1967, on which the U.N.O. has no taken action.

Group Discussion No. 34

Proposition :

NUCLEAR WEAPONS MUST BE BANNED

1st candidate. The G.T.O. Sir and Friends, I support the proposition which has been put before us. Every day, we read in the newspapers about the pollution of the atmosphere by atomic fall-out from the devices exploded by unscrupulous war-mongers. Whole regions are contaminated. Everyone knows how dangerous this can be for health and among those affected are innocent people who are made to suffer for no fault of theirs. Nuclear devices not only disturb the composition of the atmosphere but also interfere with the structure of the earth and spread disease about many of which we know nothing so far. In fact, nuclear weapons are not weapons of war in the accepted sense of the term They are diabolical engines of death and destruction. It is not possible to use them with discretion because, along with the objective against which they are directed, they destroy much more than may suffice for the purpase of war. There can be no justification for the use, and therefore, the manufacture of such weapons and I forcefully plead that they must be banned altogether.

2nd candidate. The arguments advanced by my friend, Mr. No. 1 echo the views expressed by detractors of gun-powder when it was first used and in more recent times by those who felt mortified at the supposed danger to public health from gas-fumes given out by the horseless carriage. In spite of the concern expressed by such well-meaning critics of these inventions, neither gunpowder nor the motor car were banned. The hazards, if there were any, have been removed with the help of improved manufacturing techniques and in other ways. Nuclear technologists are already engaged in the task of manufacturing a clean bomb to minimise the hazards of radiation ; and it may not long before they succeed in their efforts. It is in this direction that efforts should be concentrated rather than banning nuclear weapons altogether because, in the present political climate of the world, they serve as useful deterrents to the ambitions of states and their leaders. I, therefore, oppose the motion.

3rd candidate. I endorse the views expressed by my friend, Mr. No. 2. Those who support the proposition perhaps do not realize that had it not been for the existence of nuclear weapons, we might still have been in the midst of the second Great War, being carried on by the erstwhile allies. Humanity was rescued from the nightmare by President Harry S. Tuman's courageous decision to put the A bomb to use and ever since, we have seen how the fear of nuclear weapons being pressed into service has served to localise international conflicts which, in the absence of nuclear deterrents, could well have become the starting point for a third world war. It has happened in Korea, in Berlin and in Cuba. In case the efforts of those who are out to

ban these weapons are successful, the world will be left to the tender mercies of petulant war-lords whom nothing but a possible nuclear holocaust is keeping in check. I have, therefore, to submit that the proposition before us is unsound and the motion must fail.

4th candidate. Only recently, the world observed the twentieth anniversary of the most shameful event in the annals of man in the destruction of two cities of Japan with the first atom bombs used on this earth. The people who have been through the experience are still suffering from its ill-effects. I am surprised to find that even then, some of us have the heart to say that nuclear weapons should continue to be manufactured. They plead that the existence of such weapons acts as a deterrent against warlike tendencies. In other words, they mean to say that the fear of total destruction only prevents the mankind from being engulfed in another world war. If this is so, it is indeed a sad commentary on our civilization. In case we are civilized in the real sense, we must have more respect for life and seek to establish peace on earth by promoting the ideal of universal brotherhood of mankind. But this is hardly possible until we muster courage enough to banish all kinds of fear from our hearts and discard all weapons of destruction, particularly the nuclear variety. I, therefore, support the proposition.

5th candidate. With due apologies to my friend, Mr. No. 4, I wish to say that it is very well to talk of "respect for life" and "the ideal of universal brotherhood" but realities are very much different. The idea of banning nuclear weapons was born along with the first such weapon which was manufactured. All leading statesmen of the world have at one time or the other supported it, but in practice, they have not been able to achieve agreement over an elementary issue like the inspection of nuclear installations. The 17-nation Geneva Disarmament Conference has been plagued by deadlocks from the very outset. What is the reason? It is only this, that in international affairs mutual trust simply does not exist. A majority of the speeches made at the forums convened to find ways and means of banning nuclear weapons are no more than tongue-in-cheek performances. The ideal embodied in the proposition put to us to-day is no doubt very laudable, but in the prevailing climate of fear and distrust, it would be wholly absurd and thoroughly unrealistic to imagine that such measures can succeed. So many attempts in this direction have already failed, and no new factor has come into play to reverse the trend. I, therefore, oppose the proposition.

6th candidate. The refrain of the arguments advanced by my friend, Mr. No. 5, in support of his thesis is that all previous attempts to ban nuclear weapons have failed and that, therefore, no further attempt need be made. Does my friend mean to suggest that this is reason enough for humanity to give way to despair? That would be, to say the least, a defeatist attitude, or, to put it more mildly, an escapist attitude. I am all in favour of continuing the efforts to ban nuclear weapons, and while supporting the proposition, I would

like to invite your attention to the great economic strain that the manufacture of atomic weapons put on a country's industrial and financial resources. If all the money that is spent on the fashioning of nuclear weapons with higher and higher destructive potential is utilized to fight poverty and disease, it will surely go a long way to eliminate causes of international conflicts and tensions. The manufacture of nuclear weapons is a very telling example of the misuse of science by man. Atomic energy is a giant, which, if employed for peaceful purposes, can create immense benefits for mankind. But, unfortunately, the most powerful nations of the world are giving priority to war research which can bring nothing but destruction in its wake. It is, therefore, very necessary that the mad race is stopped at once and a complete ban on the manufacture and use of atomic weapons is enforced without delay.

7th candidate. Starting from the sling and the club, throughout the known history, man has been busy fashioning better and more efficient weapons according as his requirements of offence and defence have been changing with the changing social structure. And he will continue to do so till he can completely master his basic fighting instincts. But that will be achieved, not by bannig weapons, conventional or nuclear, but by changing the moral and ethical values which he cherishes. Till such time as that can be done, he will need weapons. The age of the sling and the arrow is past, and we are living in the nuclear era now. As all of us know, the development of nuclear weapons was not a mere accident. Man was obliged to go after them with all possible speed in order to shorten the duration of the last World War which had been taking a heavy toll of lives for more than five years. But his efforts have been well-rewarded. Besides achieving the desired purpose, he has discovered the means of shortening likely future conflicts. The development of nuclear weapons has outdated, long-drawn out ordeals the like of which have been witnessed at least twice during the present century. It has also eliminated the chances of war breaking out on flimsy pretexts. Today, more than ever, the leaders of all countries realize that to start a war in the present times means accepting a very heavy responsibility, because of the existence of weapons which can lay whole countries waste in a matter of second. Nobody is prepared to take that risk with the result that trend in favour of negotiations to settle international disputes is gaining strength. A ban on nuclear weapons at this stage can serve only to reverse the trend. I, therefore, oppose the proposition.

—

Group Discussion No. 35

Proposition :

MAN IS HEADING TOWARDS SELF-DESTRUCTION

1st candidate. Friends, those of us who agree with the proposition before us today may well be put down as incurable pessimists but it is a deplorable reality that man is heading towards self-destruction. What else can be the logical outcome of the mad race which is going on and on at an ever-accelerating pace for more and more efficient weapons of destruction ? We hear much pious talk of peaceful co-existence, disarmament, plans to stop proliferation of nuclear weapons, etc. All these themes have been in the air for nearly two decades now, and, unless we are chronic self-deceivers, we should by now know that the talk about them is more propagandist than sincere. The gap between what the great powers of the world profess and what they practise is too big to be explained away by even the most astute reasoning. All that we can say about the performance is that it is a superb tongue-in-cheek act, an excellent eye-wash. The attitude of suspicious defensiveness towards each other among world nations is too deeply entrenched to allow any relaxation in the continuing arms build-up in rival camps. In the capitalist countries, it is being further bolstered by powerful business interests in the armaments trade because these merchants of death can prosper only if international tensions are kept alive. They have created a vicious-circle which has sucked in even the socialist states. The exigencies of an unending cold war have forced all major world powers today to shift to war-economy. The world is on its way towards total annihilation. Nothing short of a miracle can reverse the direction, but unfortunately the age of miracles is long past. Man is virtually sitting on a powder-keg. The fuses are all set. Any fool who chooses to light a match-stick today can inscribe "the end" on the saga of man.

2nd candidate. The picture of unrelieved gloom painted before us just now by our friend, Mr. No. 1 is enough to give the jitters to the bravest among us. I too should have been struck dumb by its tragic grandeur, had it not been for an unshakable faith in the essential greatness of the human spirit. In building up his case, my friend has proceeded on the assumption that the world-powers are not sincere in their approach towards problems of disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. I must say the assumption is entirely fallacious. It amounts to condemning at one stroke all those who have worked and all those who are working for world peace, as hypocrites. This is, to say the least, a slur on men like Jinnah and Mr. Z. A. Bhutto who devoted their lives to earnest efforts for promoting peace on earth and goodwill towards men. And, however cynical we may be, we cannot say that their efforts bore no fruit. Looking through the dark glasses of pessimism, my friend has missed the rays of hope which are breaking through the gloom. My friend has said that the age of miracles is past. No, sir, even

today miracles like Simla Accurd can come to pass. Even today, the preference for sanity inherent in human nature can assert itself. There is no occasion to lose all Hope. In fact all of us would be the better for a little more faith in man and his essential goodness. I do not think we are heading towards self-destruction.

3rd candidate. My friend, Mr. No: 2, has appealed to all of us to have a little more fa th in the essential goodness of man. May I ask whether we of the present generation and even those of an earlier generation have any faith left in anything ? This is the age of reason. Man has become a slave of the intellect. Shorn of faith, he has fallen a victim to his own ingenuity. The inventor of machines has himself become an automation, totally unmindful of the consequences of his actions. Scientists are using their knowledge to wreak destruction on mankind. Power-mad politicians goaded by tycoons of commerce are constantly engaged in dangerous brinkmanship in order to further what is called "national self-interest" as also their own ambitions. They can any day push the world off the precipice and bring on a catastrophe. Men of faith and goodwill are scoffed at and treated as eccentrics. The mass of common people everywhere is frustrated. Modern art and literature concentrate on the morbid and the abnormal. Moral laxity and mental diseases a oren the increase. The race of man has lost its peace of mind in general. It is a lost generation which inhabits the world today.

All this is the natural outcome of the prostitution of the intellect. There is nothing which can save man from the natural consequences of his sin. However much we may wish that things should take a different course, the inexorable logic of events points in the other direction. The son of Adam appears to be under the influence of some horrible curse. He is already far-advanced on the path of self-destruction. The final catastrophe may be followed by regeneration, but for the present his fate is sealed. He is doomed to destruction.

4th candidate. My predecessor has made a valiant effort to rise the level of the discussion here to a high philosophical pitch, and in the process, he has proclaimed the doom of humanity with superb self-assurance. But all that his excursion into the realms of pure though has produced is a plethora of puerile and vague generalizations which are misleading because they are divorced from reality. My friend has condemned the present generation as a faithless generation, a lost generation. The gravamen of his charge is that in the present-day world, faith and spiritual values are on the decline. I would submit that it is not faith and spiritual values which are on the decline. It is ignorance and dogma which thrives on ignorance which are on the decline. As in every other sphere, there is a continuing renaissance in the sphere of faith also. Modern man finds solace in an enlightened faith more in accord with his changed spiritual needs. While on the one hand he has rejected serfdom and fascist philosophies, on the other he has also discarded the tyranny of hide-bound religious tradition. The spread of education and the

introduction of better means of communication and transport have served to widen his mental horizon, and we can claim a higher general standard of culture than our forefathers. Nations of the world have become more civilized and force as a way of solving international disputes is being increasingly rejected. The virtues of international co-operation and peaceful co-existence are better appreciated today than they ever were in the past. The age of power-mad politicians who could plunge the whole world into war is gone. Today's rulers know that one false move, one step they take towards disturbing the peace of the world can cost them their thrones. The people in all parts of the world known about the terrible alternatives for peace in existence today and they are in no mood to allow anybody to play with the future of mankind.

There is a good time coming and man is sure to scale new moral, material and spiritual heights in the coming years. I see no reason for endorsing the proposition before us.

5th candidate. As my friend, Mr. No. 4 was speaking, I was feeling as if I was being taken on a conducted tour of Utopia. Well, the world full of peace and promise of which he has just now spoken in such glowing terms would be a really wonderful place ,to live in. if only it had existed outside over-fertile imaginations. The world that you and I know of is very much different. It is a world full of strife, dissensions and trouble-spots. At a dozen places, fires are burning which threaten to spread and engulf the whole world, Vietnam, Kashmir, Nigeria, Yemen, Middle East, Rhodesia are the manifestations of something very different from the urges for peaceful co-existence and co-operation of which my able friend has spoken. It is in these places that we can see to what depths man has sunk or is capable of sinking. If there is one field in which he can be said to have made any progress, it is the field of hypocrisy. He has learnt the art of talking through his hat. In one breath he talks about banishing hunger from this earth, and in the other proceeds to wipe out entire defenceless population by raining hell from the air. On the one hand, he talks about self-determination for the people of a neighbouring country, and on the other denies basic human rights to his own countrymen. The freedom-fighters in Aden face police bullets while rebels in Rhodesia have everything the way they want. It is on the whole a disgusting spectacle. I don't say this sort of hypocrisy is universal and unredeemed. Exceptions, and very honourable exceptions, have been there and are there. But exceptions only prove the rule. In spite of all his claims to being cultured and civilized, man is still very much subject to primitive passions like fear, hatred and violence. The culture and refinement he boasts of are not more than shin-deep. Basically, he remains the brute he ever was, and if he is marching towards self-destruction, it is but natural. War is one of his natural instincts, and however strong the "forces on the side of peace" may be, this natural instinct is bound to assert itself and result in his destruction.

6th candidate. My friend, Mr. No. 5 and those among us who agree with his way of thinking will excuse me if I differ with them in regard to the conclusions they have drawn from the present-day state of affairs. I am one of those who ardently believe that the natural state of man is peace, and not war, and that the essence of his nature is good and not evil. He is too noble a creation of God to have been doomed to self-destruction. It is true that his strewn with difficulties, and before finding his ultimate destiny, he will have to overcome a host of hurdles, including the baser elements in his own nature, but there can be hardly any doubt that, like Sisyphus, he will in the end achieve the mountain top. Difficulties must not make us afraid and disheartened. We can probably never have roses, roses all the way. Thorns too will be there. If there are a few individuals who cannot see the roses for the thorns or who are too afraid of the thorns to venture forth, it does not mean that the march of humanity will come to a stop. To believe that man is heading for self-destruction is to give up hope. It betrays a negative attitude of mind, which distorts the vision. As important as the realities is the way in which we look at them.

Let us try to look at it this way. Twice in the course of the last fifty years, man has felt the necessity of forming some sort of an international organization with the primary object of preventing war. The age of secret diplomacy is over and today all international differences are discussed in the full glare of publicity so that the whole world can know and judge who is in the wrong Secret alliances and treaties are no longer possible in this era of open diplomacy. Economic barriers between nation and nation are crumbling. The more prosperous nations of the world are becoming increasingly aware of their responsibility to help the under-developed regions economically. The war to banish poverty, ignorance and disease from this earth is being waged with international co-operation. International collaboration in the sphere of scientific research is increasing. These are all significant developments ,which definitely hold the promise of a more peaceful and prosperous future for mankind. As compared to these, conflicts mentioned by my friend, Mr. No. 5 are no more than ripples on the surface. In any case efforts to localise these and other such conflicts have been successful. The bogey of an impending nuclear catastrophe is more imaginary than real because nuclear weapons have been developed primarily as weapons of defence and they have made the prospects of a world so terrible that it has become one of the imponderables.

On the whole, I see no reason to despair. All the disagreements and conflicts in the world notwithstanding, man is on his way to building a better world rather than heading towards self-destruction.

Group Discussion No. 36

Topic :

PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN PAKISTAN

1st candidate. The G.T.O., Sir and Friends! While our country has a large number of problems, the problem of unemployment stands out as a significant one. With the increase in the population, the problem is assuming serious proportions. We find a large number of people in Pakistan, floating hither and thither in search of the jobs. Definite statistics are not available on the subject, but statistics are hardly required to prove what is obvious to every one., The fact of unemployment is somewhat hidden by the joint family system where every one is supported out of a common pool of income, and the religious institutions which support a vast majority of people.

2nd caudidate. We have three main types of unemployment, namely, agricultural unemployment, industrial unemployment and unemployment amongst the uneducated people. The causes of unemployment in agriculture are numerous. Firstly, the pressure on population on land is increasing and the farm can no longer employ and absorb the increased numbers. Secondly, the lack of subsidiary industries in the villages, adds to the unemployment. Thirdly, the agricultural operations keep the farmer busy only for a part of the year and for the rest of the months he is unemployed. This fact is referred to as under-employment, in our agriculture. Lastly, the uncertainty and vagaries of Pakistani Monsoons render the agriculturist unemployed whenever the crops fail. That is why the Pakistan agriculture is said to be a gamble of the Monsoon. Due to all the above reasons, the state of unemployment in agriculture is growing worse every day.

3rd candidate. Let us now examine the causes of industrial unemployment. Firstly, our industrial system is unable to absorb the growing population, because the industrial development is not commensurate either with the vast resources of the country or with the growth of its population. Secondly, the location of industries is defective and uneconomic. There is overcrowding in certain areas which results in the rise of cost of production. If the geographic distribution of the industries had been rationally planned, the industrial structure would have been more economical and its capacity for employment would have increased tremendously. Thirdly, the periodic occurrence of depressions in the industry bring about unemployment. Fourthly, the export industries have not been able to maintain their hold on foreign markets. Thus there has been a decrease in employment in the export industries whicn is transmittec to other industrial sectors.

4th candidate. The remedy for industrial unemployment lies in stepping up industrial efficiency. Also the scope for the developing various industries is immense. Agriculture is already overcrowded and so are the liberal professions. Thus industry is the only hope for rooting out unemployment from the country. To achieve this a complete overhauling, reorientation and rationalisation of our industrial system is needed.

5th candidate. Coming to the problem of unemployment among the educated classes, the situation is quite serious, because this category of people is intelligent and vocal. The existence of this type of unemployment is attributed to the too literary character of education. There is a mass production of graduates. Every year huge numbers pass out of the college and there is not enough demand for them. The remedy lies in providing professional and technical education to the people and stepping up economic development to absorb these people.

6th candidate. Unemployment is not an act of God, as the Pakistani masses given to fatalistic thinking are prone to imagine. Unemployment is not a natural calamity but the consequence of defective human organisation. It arises from the incapacity of the economic system to adjust itself to changing conditions of population, etc. If consumption and production are properly planned and balanced, the incidence of unemployment can be mitigated to a minimum necessary extent. Unemployment is a curse. Apart from the material waste it involves, it brings about demoralisation.

———

Group Discussion No. 37

Proposition :

WAR BRINGS OUT THE BEST IN A NATION

1st candidate. The G.T.O. Sir and Friends ! War has been universally condemned in all ages as an evil, but so far no way has been found to eliminate the possibilities of war. Therefore, even though it is an evil, we may, without fear of contradiction, say that it is a necessary evil. And yet, with all the evil that is associated with it, war has its good points as well. The proposition before us today enunciates one such good point. That war brings out the best in a nation as axiomatic.

History is full of numberless instances which go to prove the truth in these words. In order to find out such instances, we need not go back to ancient times. Even recent history is replete with them. In the beginning of the Second World War, when Great Britain was left almost alone to face the German might, and was passing through what was perhaps the gloomiest hour in its annals, the imminent danger to their country brought out the best in the islanders. Their bold courage, grim determination and supreme defiance of heavy odds was something wonderful and ennobling to behold.

Here in Pakistan we have seen the same phenomenon. The way the whole Pakistan nation rose as one man against the Indian attack in 1965 demonstrated that when a nation's freedom, sovereignty or pride is endangered by war, people forget their internal differences and come together to face the danger. No amount of propaganda in favour of national integration could have created that all-pervading sense of unity which moved Pakistan during this war. Leaving everything else, this in itself is not a small thing. Unity is the most prized possession a nation can boast of, and its best attribute. War brings it out as nothing else does. I am therefore convinced that war brings out the best in a nation.

2nd candidate. My friend Mr. 1, while admitting that war is an evil, has at the same time paid eloquent tribute to it by supporting the proposition before us today. I am sorry he has not been able to convince me with his argument. Unity in the face of a common danger is but natural, and is not a phenomenon peculiar to war alone. Even natural catastrophes like earthquakes, floods or famines can also galvanise whole nation into united action to relieve distress. Thus, my able friend's choice of national unity brought about by war to illustrate his point appears to have led his argument off at a tangent. And he may not have fallen into the error, had he not set out to defend a weak case. As he has himself agreed, war is an evil, and an unmitigated evil at that—and nothing but evil can result from it. It is a legacy from the days when the world was ruled by brute force. It is bad enough that man has not been able to renounce it even though he claims to have become civilized. But on top of it, to see good in it and to extol its virtues is the limit.

Everyone knows that war is a thing which brutalizes men, ruins the economy of nations and subverts all moral values. It destroys both the victor and the vanquished. It leaves in its wake sorrowful trails of death and destruction, bitterness and hatred, and it takes years to repair the damage. Its appeal lies to the baser instincts of man. It clouds the vision, perverts the truth and erodes individual national and international morality. It thus brings out, not the best, but the basest in men and nations alike.

3rd candidate. The impassioned condemnation of war we have just heard from our friend, Mr. No. 2, was impressive indeed ; and I should be dubbed a hawk and a war-monger if I were not to join him in the anti-war sentiments he has so forcefully expressed.

But so far the proposition we are discussing goes, I must say that if Mr. No. 1 went off at a tangent, my able predecessor has completely missed the mark. Instead of saying what war brings out, he has concerned himself with what it imposes It is no double a woe and a calamity which spreads death and destruction. But calamities destroy only the weak. The strong gain further strength from them and emerge stronger. A nation pitted in a determined stand against unjust might displays the spiritual grandeur of man in all his glory.

It is in times of war that a nation's hidden reserves of power and capacity to make sacrifices come into play. War brings out a people's capacity for self-sacrifice and makes heroes out of ordinary men and women. It is true nobody wants it, but when it comes, it feeds and inspires the noble sentiment of patriotism as nothing else does. It is the fire which tempers the steel, which purifies the gold but burns down all dirt and dross. It is a fire-test of a nation's strength and undoubtedly brings out the best it holds.

4th candidate. Rather than comparing what war imposes and what it brings out as my friends Mr. No. 2 and Mr. No. 3 have just now done with great ability, I would compare the forces released by war and the impulse provided by peace. If we look at the proposition before us in this way, I am sure there can be no doubt that it is peace and not war that brings out the best in a nation.

War is not the natural state of man. It is a negative condition and induces negative thinking. All the qualities it brings out, *e.g.*, determination to fight, to suffer hardships, and to sink differences for the time being are negative qualities which, though good in themselves, are certainly not the best qualities of a people. The best in men and nations are the creative and constructive urges which, translated into action, take man along the path of progress. It is only in peace that a nation can think of and work for progress. Art and literature which express the best minds of a people can flourish only in peace.

War smothers all the finer instincts and promotes cruelty, vice and stupidity. It has a positively demoralising influence. As such, it is incapable of bringing out the best in a nation which can be possible only in peace-time.

5th candidate. I heartily support the view presented by Mr. No. 4. Wars break out only when nations have lost their ideals and moral standards, and are left with hardly worthwhile which can be brought out.

When a country is engaged in a war, the false glitter of frenzy braggadocio which is let loose in torrents deludes people into mistaking a universal sense of fear in the face of common danger for national unity and desperation as calm determination. The loudest cries for the enemy's blood are generally raised by those who are themselves sitting at a safe distance from the front and relish the thought of others doing the dirty work to preserve their safety. The

propaganda machinery of the state does it best and uses various devices to induce mass hysteria among people so that they start behaving like a herd rather than like men. Civil liberties are ruthlessly curbed under cover of an emergency.

These are some of the necessary concomitants of any War fought anywhere in the world. When such are the conditions which wars inevitably create, I fail to understand, how they can bring out the best in nations.

7th candidate. The way my friend, Mr. No. 6, has analysed the psychology of a nation at war is, to say the least, a perversion of truth. In trying to belittle national unity and resolve by describing them as the products of mass-frenzy and braggadocio, my friend has, I am afraid, displayed unusual cynicism.

All of us here are of course agreed that war is a bad thing But just as adversity is man's true touchstone, battle-fields are the testing grounds of nations. They bring out all that is finest in a people's national character. They not only bring to the surface the sense of unity, the spirit of patriotism, courage and inherent in nations but also help to discover the peaks of efficiency, inventiveness and discipline of which the combatants are capable.

To say that wars smother creative activity like art and literature is also far from the truth. On the other hand, the numberless deeds of heroism and gallantry performed on the battle field provide great inspiration to writers and poets, and bring out their best.

I, therefore, endorse the proposition with all the emphasis I command.

Group Discussion No. 38

Proposition :

WAR IS INEVITABLE

1st candidate. The G.T.O. Sir and Friends ! The fighting instinct is one of the basic human characteristics, and the desire for adventure is a part of human nature. From the earliest known period of history, wars have been a prominent feature of man's life on earth. Against every single year of peace, history has recorded thirteen years of war. The early period in the annals of India, Egypt, Greece and Rome is full of tales of war and conquest, in each of which virile men have occupied the centre of the stage and won laurels by their heroic exploits. The legendary heroes continue to inspire young minds all over the world and induce among them the desire to stalk the earth like Colossuses winning glory for their motherland through display of valour, the right place for which is the battlefield. War is very much in the human character and as long as the human race inhabits the earth, it is inevitable.

2nd candidate. My friend, Mr. No. 1 has been carried away by the mistaken notion that man is essentially a brute, a slave to the baser

instincts in his nature. Those of my friend's way of thinking forecast nothing but gloom for the human race and just refuse to take note of the bright spots which illuminate the horizon of civilization. Man has travelled a long way from the age when he was an ignorant slave of fear and violence. He has learnt to train and restrain his emotions and instincts so that there is hope of "a good time coming". The impulse has already been given and he is on his way to realize that wars do not solve any problems, and that, on the other hand, if ever another world war breaks out, it will certainly lead to the total extermination of humanity. He has already seen enough horrors to embark upon the suicidal course again. We can depend upon man's inherent good sense and say that wars are a thing of the past and there is no possibility of the world being involved in the business again.

3rd candidate. I wish all of us here could share the optimistic view taken by my friend, Mr. No. 2. At least I for one do not see any sign of "the good time coming" ; and I don't see how anyone can talk of such a thing in the midst of the feverish preparation going on all over the world for the final show-down. My able friend thinks that man has already seen enough horrors and that he would not go to war again but as a matter of fact, the horrors he has seen have by no means dampened his spirits. However horrible wars may become, man will always feel attracted by the prospect, even if for nothing but the relief war provides from the boredom and monotony of life in times of peace. A soldier going to the battle-front very well knows what he is in for but somehow he deludes himself in the belief that it is the next fellow who is going to die, and as for himself, he will have all the fun. Every now and then, ambitious leaders of men will appear on the world scene to fire such people's imagination with ideas of new worlds to conquer, and occasionally they will relieve the tedium of routine existence with sparks which will start world-conflag rations. War is one of the natural conditions of human life and cannot be avoided. It is inevitable.

4th candidate. My friend, Mr. No. 3 would have us believe that the whole human race is prepared to commit suicide at the bidding of any lunatic with enough personal hypnotism to fire men's imaginations with vision of new worlds to conquer. The havoc played by wars in the past with the economy of the most powerful nations, besides ihe trail of misery following in the wake of world-conflicts, would be enough to deter any national leader from plunging his people into reckless adventures unless he has lost his head completely. The fate of attempts made by Germany during the first half of the present century is written across the pages of world history in tears and blood ; and it is extremely improbable if another people would take it into their heads to repeat the performance. Even then, the most we can say is that war may not be beyond the pale of possibility, but it is certainly not inevitable.

5th candidate. What my friend, Mr. No. 4 has said may be logically true but it is hardly related to facts. We have not yet learnt to think collectively as members of the human race. A stage may come

when we learn to think in that way but as long as nationalism holds sway, rivalries are bound to exist between nation and nation in the political and economic spheres. Powerful nations would continue trying to patronise the weaker nations and newly emerging powers will go on with their efforts to assert their presence. These tendencies will inevitably lead to war, and nations which do not prepare for war will always tempt those with surplus military capacity. Political and economic rivalries can hardly be removed by arbitration or merely by good words. Even in the face of strenuous efforts for the abolition of war as a means of settling international disputes, such inequities will cause wars till the whole world comes to be governed by a social system which eliminates economic disparities. That day is yet far off and till then, we have to accept war as inevitable.

6th candidate. That national rivalries continue to exist is hardly enough reason to conclude that this will lead inevitably to war. With the progress man has made in communications and means of transport, the world has become such a small place that no conflict can remain localised for long. It is no longer possible for any two nations to settle their differences by resort to arms and to wage a war in isolation. Other nations always jump into the fray. Wars of conquest or subjugation are a relic of the past. Neither has it been found possible to propagate ideologies by force. Consequently, in the present-day world, war hardly serves any purpose and the time is not far off when statesmen of the world will realise its utter futility. Hope for mankind is still there. Everything is not lost. We may depend upon man's instinct of self-preservation to prevent repetition of past errors and renounce war for all purposes, and for all times.

7th candidate. I have been listening carefully to what my friends on both sides have had to say. In my opinion, those who consider war as a discarded phenomenon are indulging in purely wishful thinking. Instead of talking with our heads in the clouds, let us plant our feet firmly on this earth and then have a look at things. See what is still going on in Vietnam, on the Kashmir border, on the banks of the Suez Canal, in Cyprus, on West German borders, on Arab-Israel borders and in other places. All these conflicts are the rumblings of the Third World War which is going to be upon us before long. The poison that bedevils international relations is bound to result in some blood-letting before the world can breathe easily once again. To hope that these conflicts will be automatically resolved or go on indefinitely as they are without developing further is only wishing for the moon. War is not inevitable ; we are already in its midst.

8th candidate. To accept the thesis propounded by my friend, Mr. No. 6 would mean rejecting all that the United Natio..s stands for. It would mean that all efforts to achieve disarmament, to ban nuclear tests, etc., were nothing but hypocrisy on an international scale. However bleak the prospect may appear to be, I do not find it in my heart to believe that so many wise men of the world have been indulging in mere eye-wash for nearly two decades or that they were not

motivated by sincerity in their efforts to eliminate war from this world. I refuse to believe that men like Jinnah and Ayub Khan were victims of delusion and that their good work will have no effect and the world will again find itself in the throes of a suicidal conflict. In every country there are men of good sense, who are bound to exert their utmost to see that the fair name of their nation is not tarnished as the initiator of a world catastrophe. I have full faith that ultimately the powers of peace will prevail and we shall not see the irony of another war to end all wars.

9th candidate. I am moved by the faith my friend. Mr. No. 7 places in the United Nations Organization and its disarmament schemes. I have no doubt that numberless people all over the earth share that faith but it is a tragic fact that these efforts to eliminate war from the earth are sure to go waste. We are already witnessing now the U.N.O. has been paralysed in the game of power politics. It is already reduced to the position of a helpless spectator, while conflicts go on erupting all over the world. Is it in a position today to do something about Vietnam ? My friend, Mr. No. 7 may not believe it but it is a fact that those who profess love for peace indulge in mere lip-service and they are deceiving the world by inculcating a false sense of security among the peoples of the earth. The clouds of war hang heavy over mankind once again and we have no choice but to prepare for another holocaust of death and destruction.

Group Discussion No. 39

Proposition :

SCIENCE IS A MENACE TO CIVILIZATION

1st candidate. The G.T.O. Sir and Friends ! Anybody who attempts an intelligent appraisal of the impact of science on human civilization is bound to reach the conclusion that in the garb of progress. Science is threatening not only to destroy our civilization but also to wipe man off the face of the earth It has no doubt added to the comforts of daily living, but look at the price we have to pay for these small mercies. Every day we hear of the invention of newer and more efficient engines of destruction which can lay waste whole countries in no time. Thanks to our erstwhile backwardness, man has managed to survive two World Wars in the first half of this century, but in case a third breaks out, science has equipped us with such deadly weapons, that it is bound to end up with the total annihilation of both the victors and the vanquished. The possession of such efficient means of destruction has been instrumental in the development of a war psychosis and every day that passes brings nearer the hour of doom when man will have to pay the price for what little science has been able to do for him, with the great progress it has achieved in working against him. It has undoubtedly proved to be a menace to human civilization.

2nd candidate. I am afraid the indictment of science just pronounced by my friend No. 1 strikes me as one-sided and so utterly unconvincing. Can we place the blame squarely on science ? Science is knowledge, and knowledge in itself is never bad. It is the application thereof to questionable purposes which is bad ; and for this, man, rather than science is to blame. In the trained and disciplined hands of a surgeon a knife becomes a life-saving device, but in the hands of an uncivilised brute, the same knife can become a murderous tool. Can we say that in the latter case, the knife is to blame ? Similar is the case with science. If the discoveries of science are employed by man for evil purposes, how is science to be blamed ? What menaces civilization is man's quarrelsomeness, fear and greed and not science. Science is a blessing provided man develops the capacity to derive its full benefits. I therefore oppose the motion.

3rd candidate. My friend, No. 2 has very ably put forward the case for science, and I might have supported his thesis, but I would like to invite the attention of the votaries of scientific and technological advancement to the misery such progress brings in its wake by throwing thousands of artisans and craftsmen out of employment. Increase of production through mechanical efficiency has played havoc with conditions in the labour-market and spread untold misery. This is a direct result of scientific progress outstripping the needs of society and thus assuming the role of a menace to human civilization. Let us admit that we have not so far been able to integrate science into the requirements of human existence. Society has yet to readjust itself to the changes being so rapidly wrought by the science and until this has been done, science will continue to be a menace to civilization.

4th candidate. I agree with what my able friends, Mr. No. 1 and Mr. No. 3 have just said Science, and all progress that it has achieved is gradually leading man to his doom. Rapid scientific advance has been continuously forcing the pace of life so that it has been robbed of all grace. New inventions, backed by the latest techniques of sales promotion, have brought about an artificial increase in human needs and made a whole generation needy and greedy. In the breakneck race for material well-being, nobody has the time to stand and stare. Greed has become the primary and the greatest motive force which goods men to ceaseless effort for acquiring more and more "good things of life" as they call them. Again, it is greed which has driven nations to rise in arms against each other. And what is the result ? In his pursuit of material happiness, man has lost his most precious possession, peace of mind. While he has learnt to pamper his body, he has ignored things of the spirit which give him superiority over other forms of life. In this race for progress, man is fast going downhill. The craze for speed takes a heavy toll of human life not only the highways, but also increasing the number of suicides and mental cases which is a direct result of the artificial acceleration induced by science in the pace of life. We are, therefore, driven to the inescapable conclusion that science is a menace to human civilization.

5th candidate. Let me say at once that I do not share the unbounded pessimism of my friends who are out to condemn science as an unmitigated evil and a devil which threatens the very existence of civilization. The apprehensions expressed by my friend No. 1 about the approaching doomsday, the concern displayed by my friend No. 3 over the deleterious effects of scientific progress on our social structure and the way my friend No. 4 has bemoaned the faster pace of life leave me unimpressed because there is hardly any basis for such a gloomy view of things. A little deeper thinking will reveal that if there is anything which has deterred man from following his baser and basic warlike instincts, it is the so-called "engines of destruction." No world-statesman who is sane will accept the responsibility for starting a world war today because science has made the final outcome abundantly clear. If improved methods of production have enabled fewer men to do the same amount of work, it follows that the same number of men can do much more work and produce much more wealth to raise the general standard of living, and with greatly reduced hours of work. In fact, scientific methods, by reducing the drudgery in life give man the chance to devote some time to his spiritual well-being so much in the thoughts of my friend, No. 4. He has also referred to deaths on the highways. Why does he forget that it is science which has helped man to conquer epidemics and fell diseases like tuberculosis and cancer. I am doubtful if many here would share his attachment to a static life. Even granted that today the risk to life is greater, is this drawback not more than compensated by the still greater charm which science has bestowed on life. Far from being a menace, science is in fact a blessing for civilization for which we cannot be grateful adequately.

6th candidate. By now man has, I believe, travelled a long way from the days when he regarded lightning as a sign of god's anger and a comet as a sign of misfortune. In this journey, he has shed quite a load of superstitions and misbeliefs. He now takes pride in calling himself "civilized". To those who condemn science, I would put a simple question : How did this process of civilization come about ? There can be no two answers. The only answer is "through science". In fact my friends on the opposite side have been confusing science with products of scientific research as available to man. Science is just another name for a spirit of enquiry which is man's best possession. It has so far helped him on the road to progress and will continue to do so in future. Whatever the detractors of science may say, the valuable contribution it has made to civilising man cannot be underrated. How can we condemn it as a menace to civilization ? It has helped the process of civilization. Whatever has been said to the contrary is based on man's incapacity to make good use of it, and as my friend No. 2 had occasion to point out, the blame for misuse of science has to be laid at the door of man and not at that of science. As somebody has wisely observed, "Science is a good servant but a bad master." If, instead of making science the servant of human progress, we have allowed it to feed our hatred and anger, it is our own fault and it does not lie in our mouth to say that

science is a menace to civilization.

7th candidate. Friends, If we give deep thought to the proposition before us, we shall find that it betrays some confusion of thought. The great teachers of ancient time employed very rigid methods of screening the applicants who sought admission to their classes. This screening was aimed at preventing undesirable people from gaining access to knowledge, because those great preceptors were convinced that knowledge must be imparted to those only who could be depended upon to put it to good use for the benefit of humanity.

But in the present age, unfortunately the only criterion for admission to educational institutions remains the capacity to bear the expenses. Our system of education does not provide for any screening of aspirants for their intrinsic strength of character. The result is that in general, science has become the hand-maiden of people whose notions of social morality are questionable. It is certainly not the fault of science. Hence I oppose the proposition.

Group Discussion No. 40

Proposition :

HAS U.N.O. SERVED ANY CONCRETE PURPOSE

1st candidate. Gentlemen, Prior to hitting upon the cream of the topic concerned, let me remind you of the late Mr. Kennedy's words, which he used, while addressing the 18th session of the U.N. General Assembly: "Let us build up the U.N. as a peace-keeping and peace-fostering organization and as a means for providing aid to developing countries."

It should be noted carefully that today the U.N.O. has a membership of 126 sovereign countries of the world. It is entirely wrong to suggest that the United Nations is a force and that it has not been able to do anything concretely genuine for the cause of world peace. Again I challenge, rather pretty emphatically, the view that the United Nations Organization has miserably failed in its cherished mission, *i.e.*, of maintaining world peace and world order. The U.N.O. has endeavoured its best to do the needful for humanity, and in so many spheres it has attained glimmering success, for example, in the case of Congo, Korea, Viet Nam, West Irian and in the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia. Of course, the United Nations Organization has not been able to tackle some of the outstanding problems of the world, like those of Berlin, Laos and South Viet Nam. But the most redeeming aspect of optimism has been the signing of the East-West partial nuclear test-ban treaty.

2nd candidate. Gentlemen, with due apology to my friend who spoke first, I would like to point out the glaring fact rather the most unpleasant fact, which my friend failed to touch upon while expressing his views on the efficacy of the world Forum, known as the United Nations.

In my opinion, the U.N O., like its predecessor, the League of nations, has been more a farce than a reality. It has not served any of the missions for which it was brought into being after the collapse of the League of Nations. May I ask what it has done in connection with the Indo-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir ? Again, may I ask what the U.N. has done to solve the 19-year-old Berlin problem? It is due to this issue that the entire continent of Europe has been made a battlefield for the last 19 years. It is due to this problem, and only this problem, that the world has been tormented by the fear of cold war. What has the U.N. done in solving the greatest problem of our age, *i.e.*, of complete and general disarmament ? The Moscow partial nuclear test-ban pact has indeed been signed,. but it does not and *shall not* stop nuclear testing, especially the underground nuclear tests. Disarmament conferences have been "a much ado about nothing" Complexity of world situation has gone from bad to worse. The United Nations organisations has been really a farce.

3rd candidate. Gentlemen, I am also concurrent with my friend who spoke just now and my views are almost identical with those of my friend, especially on the point that the U.N O. has failed—and failed miserably to transform its ideal into practice. It has not been able to offer any relief to the nuclear-war-terrorized world. The U.N.O., as a matter of fact, has been more or less an arena where. mental gymnastics of the two rival Power blocs have been witnessed, I am with my learned friend, *i e*, speaker No. 2, when he opines that the U.N O. has been nothing but a bundle of self-contradictions. It has absolutely nothing to call original, genuine or realistic. It is the same old institution, *i e.*, the League of Nations which had been defrauding the people for a number of years and at last brought about the second World War.

I would certainly say that the U N O is simply a symbol, having no realistic and concrete mission ; I am afraid I may not be forced to describe it as a "farce" as my friend has just now described it.

4th candidate. Gentlemen, I have watched the speeches of the last two debators and also reflected upon their arguments, which they displayed. But I regret that both of them had been sentimentally buttressed and that both took up a perverted dogmatic line in their argument. To say that the 24-year-old U.N O. with a total membership of 126 nations, is simply a farce, is something like self-negation or self-betrayal. Again I challenge, fairly boldly, their remark that U.N.O. is dead. I would say—rather shout loudly and at the top of my voice—the United Nations is as vital and significant as any other institution on the earth can be.

My learned friends have said that the U.N.O. has not performed any useful accomplishment in maintaining world peace. May I remind them the splendidly glorious work which it has done in the Congo ? Has it not solved the problem of West Irian, which otherwise might have caused a war between Indonesia and the Netherlands ? Has it not solved the Palestine problem ? Did not the retired

U.N. Secretary-General U Thant, intervene in the Cuban missile episode which was going to envelop the world with a full-fledged nuclear war? And it will not be out of place if I say that the Moscow East-West partial test-ban treaty is a document of history originated from the efforts of the United Nations. Gentlemen, how can one say, then, that the U.N.O. is simply a symbol or a farce?

5th candidate. Gentlemen, I do not entirely agree with my learned friend who has just furnished his arguments in favour of the effectiveness and efficacy of the United Nations Organization as a world-forum for maintaining world peace. My friend has been over-optimistic in his estimate about the U.N.O. and its accomplishments or achievements.

Indeed, in the Congo the U.N.O. did splendidly, especially in its military operation against the reactionary elements of Katanga. But you must know that the Congo is a small country and it has no military power like that of Russia, China, or the United States. It is very easy to deal with a weak and militarily impotent country like Congo or Israel, but can the U.N.O. deal with a similar problem with the Soviet Union or China?

In order to be effective in its decision and operation, the United Nations must maintain a powerful and strong force at its disposal. Moreover it must also have an accord for unanimity among its members. The two powerful member blocs, the United States and U.S.S.R, are not at all co-operating with the United Nations and the organization is too weak to censure either of these two Powers.

6th candidate. Gentlemen, I would like to use the historic quotation from the writings of Joseph Addison, *i.e.*, "much can be said on both sides." The United Nations has its two account-sheets of debit and credit, as regards its achievements and failures. But I shall be the last man to form a pessimistic view about the future of this world-forum—the beacon of hope for frustrated and war-terrorized humanity today.

Particularly with the heavier weight of non-aligned states, which have recently joined its membership, the United Nations has evolved a new outlook. Out of its total membership of 126, 57 are from non-aligned Afro-Asian countries. So the voting weight at the U.N.O. is with these non-aligned countries. The Anglo-American or NATO bloc and the Soviet bloc are numerically inferior to the non-aligned bloc. With the accumulation of majority of votes by the non-aligned nations the picture of the U.N.O. has undergone a radical change.

Gentlemen, the United Nations is the only hope of peace and peaceful coexistence in the world. We should never even imagine its decay. May the U.N.O. live long!

———

Group Discussion No. 41

Proposition :

SHOULD MODERN SCIENCE BE CONDEMNED

1st candidate. Gentlemen, I feel ashamed when I am compelled to condemn modern science and modern scientists for having terrorized humanity. Today, the entire mankind is faced with the formidably grim problem of mass extinction as a result of a thermo-nuclear war. Although the partial nuclear test-ban treaty has been signed between the Soviet Union, U.S.A. and Britain, the attitude of France and China is pretty alarming.

Science and the scientists are responsible for the tension between a nation and another. The root-cause of the armament race today is science. Bertrand Russell and all other great pacifists of the world condemned the aggressively militant temper of modern science and the preverted attitude of modern scientists towards society. As a matter of fact, science which was once considered to be the noblest boon of God to man, has become the worst curse. I cannot but condemn the modern science and modern scientists, especially the scientists who manufactured the atom bombs, which devastated the cities of Hiroshima and Negasaki.

2nd candidate. Gentlemen, to some extent—rather to a great extent – I do agree with my learned friend when he condemns the temper of modern science and the attitude of modern scientists towards war. Recently the scientists of East and West are warned against playing the role of "a murderer"—"a mass-murderer of human race"!

The fact is that detached from spiritual and ethical code, science has taken up an aggressive role. Modern scientists have been converted into mass murderers. Why do they manufacture megaton, hydrogen bombs, when they know that these bombs would destroy entire human civilization ?

The U.S. and the Russian scientists, you know very well, are engaged in the production of cosmic rays for the destruction of mankind. What a pity !

Gentlemen, I would have certainly condemned scientists and science itself outright, had science not given us certain creative and constructive things like X-ray, Penicillin, Radium, etc.

3rd candidate. Gentlemen, indeed, today science is being harnessed more for destructive purposes than for constructive and creative ones. Hundreds of billions of dollars are being spent on armament-production, when with the same amount poverty of the entire world can be removed and there would be no hungry or ill-fed or ill-clothed or unsheltered on this earth. It is a pity that atomic energy, which is the greatest and most creative of the powers of Nature, is being used for killing hundreds of millions of human beings in one second.

But the question is how far we should put the blame on scientists alone. I think modern politicians and statesmen too are equally responsible for the gross prostitution of science that we witness today. And I think these bald-headed politicians and statesmen

are to be condemned. Scientists are being treated as prisoners by these political bosses—rather I would call them "political tyrants" no less condemnable than the great tyrant, Nero, who got Rome burnt while he was playing upon his fiddle !

4th candidate. Gentlemen, I quite agree with my worthy friend that our modern statesmen and politicians should be blamed for making prostitution of science. But at the same time, a good deal can be said against our modern scientists. Why do they encourage their political bosses to produce weapons of mass-destruction by making latest inventions of these dreadful weapons ? The scientists, all over the world, should make it a pledge of honour that, come what may, they would not produce anything which tends to slaughter humanity. They should take a solemn vow unanimously that they would harness the potentiality of atom only for peaceful purposes. "Atoms for Peace only"—should be their motto.

But, it is a matter of sheer pity that modern scientists, especially of Western countries and Russia, have developed a tendency to produce far more destructive weapons of science than what they already possess. Why do they inform their political bosses of the destructive potentiality of science ? They should harness constructive and creative power of science. With atomic energy they can change the face of our earth. They can change the African deserts and all other deserts of the world into smiling orchards and fields, producing so much food that the entire mankind can be fed and the question of food-shortage be solved once and for all. Unless our modern scientists develop this humanitarian outlook, we must censure their present attitude, if we don't condemn them outright.

5th candidate. Gentlemen, I agree with my worthy friend who spoke just now. Modern politicians and statesmen, who have become too much power intoxicated, should be condemned for doing prostitution of science. And at the same time, as my friend has just pointed out, scientists, too, are to be censured—if not condemned—for helping these war mongers, *i.e.*, our modern statesmen and diplomats. Why should they manufacture weapons of mass-destruction of humanity when they, with their scientific genius, can create a paradise of eternal bliss on this earth ?

But we should not condemn science. Science is the noblest boon that God has conferred upon us. Science has a highly significant and didactic mission. Its ultimate aim is to make man realize his Maker—God—which according to science, is the greatest truth. We, ourselves, are to be blamed and condemned for making perverted use of science. If a thermo-nuclear was devastates the world, we shall be held responsible for it and not science.

Gentlemen, I would suggest the establishment of international brotherhood of scientists which should make certain laws and principles for all the scientists of the world—that no scientists of any country, under any circumstances, should undertake production of any weapon that tends to destroy the world. And let such an association of world scientists offer constructive and to the United Nations in the establishment of Globial harmony and world peace.

Group Discussion No. 42

Proposition :

THE U.N.O. HAS FAILED AND MUST BE WOUND UP

1st candidate. The G.T.O. Sir and Friends! Judging from its performance over the last two decades, the only conclusion we can reach is that the future of the U.N.O. is bleak indeed. The Organization had been formed for the maintenance of international peace and security. But has its existence in any way promoted these ideals? Has it been able to achieve its objectives in any measure? In spite of its being there, the number of regional military alliances has increased in the post-war world. NATO, CENTO, SEATO, the Warsaw Pact and so many other alignments of mutually hostile force have come into being. Its decisions on such questions as Palestine and South West Africa have been honoured more in their violations by the states concerned. It was completely bypassed in settling really important questions like Berlin and Cuba. The sense of unreality which marks its deliberations is more than evident from the interminable argument which has been going on in the matter of Chinese representation. It has not been able to make the countries of the world agree to either disarmament or non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. What it has been able to achieve is stop-gap cease-fires which are even more dangerous than the problems they are supposed to have solved. Looking at all this, I feel convinced that the world body stands doomed and must be dissolved.

2nd candidate. My friend, Mr. No. 1 has just now listed some failures of the U.N.O. As all of you must have noticed, he has gone beyond the political sphere in his denunciation of the world body. I have to submit that we are too much obsessed with politics and are prone to judge everything from the political angle. Our concern with politics must not, however, be allowed to blind us the useful work done by the U.N.O. in other spheres of international co-operation, *e.g.*, Health, World Economy, Agriculture, Education, Labour, control of dangerous drugs, etc. The U.N.O. has done considerable good work in these spheres and it is neither proper nor just to simply write it off because it has not yet achieved any spectacular successes in the political field. It is enough that the nations of the world have learnt to sit together and discuss matters for the general good. I would, therefore, not join the prophets of doom who foresee nothing but a bleak future ahead. The U.N.O. is a useful organization and a step towards the establishment of a world order. Its foundations have already been securely laid and, occasional crises notwithstanding, it is bound to emerge as the greatest benefactor of mankind in the course of time.

3rd candidate. My friend, Mr. No. 2 has rightly praised the good work being done by the various agencies set up by the U.N.O. to promote international co-operation. That such international regulation of matters concerning mankind in general is a good thing cannot be denied, but in trying to bypass the complete failure of the U.N.O. on the political front, he forgets that political stability is the *sina qua non* for all social progress, and that is what the world body has not been able to achieve. It is, therefore, apparent that the U.N.O. is going the way of the League of Nations, and its political collapse is sure to be followed by the winding up of its various social agencies.

I shall not deny that sincere and strenuous efforts have been made to lead the world along the path of peace, but facts are facts and the truth of what my friend No. 1 has said cannot be denied either. In my opinion, as long as the member countries are not willing to subordinate their sovereignty and to recognise that the declared purposes cannot be achieved except by conceding some over-riding rights to an international organization committed to bringing about world peace, the existence of the U.N.O. is pointless. Because here is no hope of this coming about, I agree with the proposition before us.

4th candidate. Friends, the proposition before us today strikes me as a cry of frustration. My friends, Mr. No. 1 and Mr. No. 3 have recounted the failures of U.N.O. as also tried to give reasons why it is doomed. Are we to accept that the vast undone should be ignored because not enough has been done ? I shall concede that the U.N.O. has not been able to achieve world peace within its life of 22 years but that is hardly enough reason why it should be wound up. It may take another 20 years, or may be 200 years, but mankind will ignore the goal of bringing about international peace by all possible means and by constant striving only at its own peril. The very fact that the need for establishing an organization like the U.N.O. was felt, was a hopeful sign. That disagreement between countries persists but can be openly discussed in this forum, also signifies progress from the era of secret diplomacy and clandestine alignment of forces. The open diplomacy and the widely publicised international debates which are carried on in the chambers of the U.N.O. further strengthen the hope that all is not lost yet. Even now the nations of the world can act in unison on the basis of whatever measure of agreement they can ultimately achieve after discussions. The cease-fire enforced by the U.N.O. could not have not brought about without the concurrence of a majority of its members and these have through the last 20 years, been saving the world from a possible nuclear catastrophe. I do not agree that the U.N.O. has failed and must be wound up. If nothing else, man's instinct for self-preservation is enough to ensure that the organization will continue to function and will eventually succeed in its mission.

5th candidate. I would appeal for a little more sense of realism in this discussion. Let us try to see things as they are. It is a hard

fact that today we find the nations divided into at least four mutually distrustful groups *viz.*, a Western group led by the U S.A. an Eastern group led by the Soviet Union a dissident group led by China and a conglomeration of nations calling themselves unaligned. All these groups are working at cross purposes and by this time they have been able to undermine existence of the United Nations Organization to such an extent that its future appears really doubtful. It has become impossible for the world body to take a straight decision on any issue brought before it because the discussion is invariably vitiated by group politics. When the organization came into being, many deluded themselves in the belief that it will act as a guardian of international morality and ensure justice as between nation and nation. The myth was, however, exploded very soon by the manner in which the U.N.O. handled Kashmir and Korea. It was proved beyond any shadow of doubt that Lake Success was no more than an arena for prize-cock-fighting on the part of various groups, and that there was not necessarily to be any relation between the merits of a case and the decision reached on it by the U.N.O. In the presence of such diehard alignments, it cannot be said that all members of the organization have a common purpose before them. In the recent dispute over the peace-keeping dues, we were treated to the spectacle of a paralysed U.N.O. gasping for breath under the weight of powerful rivals, trying to get at each other's throat. As it is constituted at present, any member, especially among those who appropriated to themselves the grossly undemocratic right of veto from the outset, can hold the organization to ransom and smother it out of existence. When it has patently failed to become the means of ensuring international justice, and is obviously at the mercy of leaders of the super powers, I do not see how it can be said that it will yet survive and fulfil its destiny. To my mind, it has outlived its utility and is already well set on its way to self-extinction.

6th candidate. I agree with my friend, Mr. No. 5 in-so-far as he pleads for a sense of realism to be brought into this discussion, and, motivated by a sense of realised. I ask : what will follow if the U.N.O. goes out of business today ? The answer evidently is that the groups just now enumerated by my friend will come to hold the field against each other openly and without restraint. To what stage a development like this can lead none can be in doubt. That would be tragic. Therefore, the only alternative before us that the U.N.O. with all its faults must continue to function. This is the only means available to us to stave off total destruction which otherwise stares us in the face. It will only come nearer if we write it off because whatever its failings, it is the only organization which keeps the nations of the world together.

In spite of what the pessimists might say, it has been growing in popularity and strength all through the last 22 years. Whereas there were only 50 members to begin with, the number has now gone up to 126. Even the big Powers realise that the days when they could

successfully bargain for the support of smaller nations and muster enough voting strength to carry through proposals unplatable to their rivals, have passed beyond recall. They can no longer have things their own way. The right to veto is continuously under attack even in the Security Council. That shows that the organization is trying to get rid of its weaknesses and there is every possibility that in course of time, its functioning will be very much reformed. I, therefore, do not agree that the U.N.O. is going to collapse, or should be wound up.

———

ADDITITIONAL TOPICS WITH HINTS

WHO INFLUENCES THE BOY MOST—PARENTS, FRINDS OR TEACHERS? (*P.M.A. Long Course*)

Parents :

(1) The boy is under the sole protection of his parents.

(2) The child's psychology tends to show that he learns much by imitating his parents.

(3) There are instances of the Public School boys (boarding) going useless due to lack of parental care.

(4) Only parents can provide love, fear and training.

(5) It has been assessed by research that the cause for juvenile delinquency is lack of parental care and control.

Friends :

(1) More than half of his time a boy is in the company of his friends.

(2) He learns more from his association with his friends than from anywhere else.

(3) It is said that it is the company that he keeps that speaks of the person.

(4) There is no better and easy way of learning things from friends than others since the boy has easy access to them.

(5) It is the competitive spirit that is responsible for achievements of great men which are in turn got from friends.

Teachers :

(1) In modern times, teachers are more important than either friends or parents since the boy learns much from his teacher.

(2) It is said if you have a good teacher half the battle is won.

(3) Teacher can provide the boy not only with learning but also with other qualities since he can train and know the ways of training.

(4) The over-affection that we notice in the case of parents, or the easy goingness that we see in the case of the friends is not seen with the teacher.

Conclusion :

But it is neither the parent nor the friend nor the teacher alone that influences him. As the great verse goes, the boy learns a quarter from his parents, one quarter from his friends, another from the teacher and the rest from his experience.

Who serves the country better—a Teacher, a Soldier or a Doctor ?

Teacher :

(1) Teacher has the sole responsibility to mould a boy into best type of citizen.

(2) Only a teacher knows the art of training and he only can help the country to produce different types of men for various purposes like lawyer, doctor, soldier etc.

(3) A soldier can save the country from invasion, a doctor can save from diseases and ill-health but a teacher saves the country from all by producing the best citizens.

(4) Though the teacher is looked down upon in Pakistan, all progressive nations have realised his worth.

Soldier :

(1) A soldier saves the country by sacrificing his own life.

(2) A soldier saves the country both during the time of war as well as in peace.

(3) When we lose our freedom, what is the use of others who are but slaves.

(4) Only a soldier can give the required security for the nation.

Doctor :

(1) War against diseases is the greatest war today.

(2) Only good doctors can produce a healthy nation.

(3) Without proper health, a soldier becomes useless and the teacher is unable to produce the best in him.

(4) A doctor serves the country during peace and war and he is the one who work round the clock.

SHOULD THE WORLD BE MOULDED AND CONTROLLED BY A FEW RESPONSIBLE PERSONS OR BY MASSES ?

(P.M.A. Graduate Course)

For :

(1) If the world is controlled by a few powerful men, it means better aid and progress for underdeveloped countries.

(2) Only powerful nations can, in practice, control the world, mainly due to their economic stability.

(3) Even in U.N. though there are many countries yet things are controlled by Britain, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

(4) The control by masses will mean only confusion.

Against :

(1) It is a fundamental principle that the minority should be heard.

(2) Power in the hands of a few means corruption and dictatorship.

(3) Power by few will only bring forth discontentments, as they will try to thrust their ideas on weak nations.

(4) Even power by few is impossible since their will be fight [illegible]n two bigger nations to get control over the world.

(5) In all ways it is better to envisage a world controlled and moulded by masses since it will tend to a world democracy.

SHOULD THE SECRETS OF ATOMIC ENERGY BE GIVEN TO ALL THE NATIONS ?

(Engineering Corps)

For :

(1) The importance of atomic energy cannot be over-stressed it is a very vital factor in the present day.

(2) By giving out the secrets to fellow nations, more of scientific advancement could be expected as Newton said, "We stand on the shoulders of others".

(3) It will be expensive for a country like Pakistan if it has to buy the laboratory equipments and work.

(4) It can save time and labour.

(5) Every country cannot have eminent and learned scientists. So if this is carries out that problem will be solved.

(6) By this proposal of the I.G.M. (International Geographical Year Conference) will be fulfilled that there should be more of co-operation between the scientists.

Against :

(1) It is impractical to envisage such an idea.

(2) It will only pave the way for the race for power.

(3) Human beings are also governed by the idea of the survival of the fittest. Hence no country will be willing to part with its work.

(4) The thought of stabbing in the back cannot be avoided. So the good idea may turn to be a curse.

DISARMAMENT

(P.M.A. Graduate Coure)

For :

(1) To save the world from the present day cold war and threat to peace is only by disarmament.

(2) By disarmament countries come closer since there is no fear of enemy.

(3) Millions of dollars that are used for the armament race could be used for the helping of under developed countries.

(4) A powerful U.N. and co-operation between nations can easily achieve this objective.

(5) The test ban treaty and optimism.

Against :

(1) The idea of disarmament, the past history shows, has been a colossal joke.

(2) As long as there is no understanding between the East and the West there cannct be any disarmament.

(3) Even if disarmament is agreed upon, the vast store of atomic weapons that Russia and USA have, will still be a threat and hence it will be a failure.

(4) The idea of 'control and inspection' clauses in the disarmament policies could be used for spying purposes.

(5) Disarmament may dislocate the economic structure of the world. USA is at present helping non-leftist countries with aid and Russia with the leftlist. If there is a disarmament this help will not be seen.

(6) More than anything, as long as there is race for power disarmament cannot be a success.

WHICH IS MORE USEFUL FOR MAKING FRINDS— BOLDNESS, CLEVERNESS OR TECTFULNESS ?

(*P.M.A. Graduate Course*)

Boldness :

(1) A shy person cannot have a friends circle.

(2) Boldness and initiative make for good friendship.

(3) A bold person is always respected by others and the first impression is the last impression.

(4) When cleverness and tactfulness show the side of cunningness, boldness impresses others as straightforwardness.

Cleverness :

(1) Only a clever person can win over friends.

(2) To be clever enough to know the psychology of the other man, means he can make friends.

(3) Where boldness fails and truthfulness is found out, cleverness wins.

(4) Clever talking always impresses others.

Tactfulness :

(1) The very core of friendship remains in dealing with the other man without invoking his temper.

(2) Tactfulness means the knowledge of the art of making friends.

(3) Where boldness and cleverness fails the only way that can win over is tactfulness.

Conclusion :

But to win and influence friends as Dale Carnegie may say we need this and something more also—that it is the knowledge of the psychology of a person.

MONEY—WHETHFR IS IT EVIL OR BLESSING ?

(*Education Corps*)

Evil :

(1) It is said that money and women are the causes of quarrel.

(2) More money one has, the more material minded he becomes.

(3) It is the craze for money that has created the haves and the have nots and hence all trouble.

(4) If money was not cared for there would have been no communism, no poverty, no craze for power, no colonies, no subjugation.

Blessing :

(1) It is only money that can make a nation powerful.

(2) Money and its circulation paves the way for more trade and employment.

(3) Its craze makes one active and working.

(4) Money is standard on which every other factor revolves and hence its importance.

(5) Money is the blessing since it can buy comfort and thus happiness.

ARE WE MORE CIVILISED THAN OUR FOREFATHERS ?

(*P.M.A. Long Course*)

For :

(1) There is no comparison between the naked forefathers who went hunting and the present humans.

(2) The various comforts and scientific advancement show we are more civilised.

(3) There are undereamt things like flying a rocket to the moon, that we have achieved as a result of the progress of technology.

(4) When our forefathers were savage enough to kill their brothers, and marry their own sisters, we are looking at these in a civilised manner.

Against :

(1) Our civilization is just an illusion.

(2) Though we have so-called comforts, our forefathers were having more peace of mind.

(3) It is difficult to say which civilization is better since we are partial to measure them with our own standard.

(4) If they killed their brothers we are killing people by thousands by atomic bombs.

(5) A civilization with all these unrest and suspicions is worse knew nothing.

WHO COULD RUN THE GOVERNMENT BETTER—MEN OR WOMEN ?

(*Education Corps*)

For Men :

(1) History show man is the best to run a Government.

(2) Though woman may be intelligent she cannot run a Government as she lacks courage and other qualities.

(3) A woman's nature itself is not fit for running a house and looking after children.

(4) Running a Government is not maintaining a house and looking after children.

(5) History has shown women have been a failure.

For Women :

(1) There is no differences between men and women except in form.

(2) She is as intelligent and courageous as man.

(3) Many instances could be quoted for their success in Government.

(4) Women with their sweet temper can understand the problems patiently and better.

(5) If they can mould a king why not a kingdom ?

SHOULD WOMEN HAVE COMPLETE EQUALITY WITH MEN ?

(*P M.A. Long Course*)

For :

(1) God created men and women to be partners and not subordinates. Simon De Beauvou rightly remarks that one is not born but rather becomes a woman.

(2) The necessity of uplifting woman's status is never overemphasised.

(3) Equality of status makes them work better for the nation.

(4) A woman who moulds a king, could she be said to be inferior ?

(5) The earlier we give them equal status the better it is.

Against :

(1) Man was correct when he said women should not be given equality.

(2) It will only lead to unpleasant quarrels in society.

(3) It will only lead them to neglect their children and thus spoiling the nation.

(4) It will lead to immorality and other vices.

(5) If women are given equality satan will again work throguh her to destroy the happiness of mankind.

WHICH QUALITY IN A WIFE IS PREFERABLE—BEAUTY, WEALTH OR CHARACTER ?

(*P.M.A. Long Course*)

For :

I—(1) Woman without beauty is like a flower of the desert.

(2) Beauty will help to lessen the family quarrels.

(3) A thing of beauty is a joy for ever.

(4) What is wealth and character despite beauty ?

(5) She will spend less on cosmetics and clothes because of her natural beauty.

(6) A beautiful wife might have character as well as wealth.

(7) A beautiful wife is a great asset socially and professionally.

II—(1) In the modern world wealth is everything to a wife.

(2) Financial troubles are the main reasons for family quarrels.

(3) Beauty will only lead to quarrels but wealth will only help to avoid it.

(4) Wealth can buy happiness.

III—(1) Without character wife is like a wolf.

(2) Lack of character means quarrels and unpleasantness.

(3) Beauty and wealth are only secondary to character.

(4) Only good character can create an atmosphere of real affection in family life.

WHICH LIFE OF A STUDENT IS BETTER LIFE—IN A HOSTEL OR LIFE OF A DAY-SCHOLAR ?

(*P.M.A. Graduate Course*)

For Hostel :

(1) Life in hostel brings him into touch with young blood.

(2) It gives the first lessons for independent and responsible living.

(3) It gives more time to spare for studies and games.

(4) It keeps away family worries and makes the student life happy.

(5) It teaches discipline as he is required to do things according to a schedule laid down by the authorities.

(6) He learns to lead co-operative life because so many students live together.

For Day Scholar :

(1) Day-scholar gets both parental love and education.

(2) He gets better attention for studies since parents will have an eye on him.

(3) He is not disturbed by bad companions.

(4) His life is not run on wrong track by the independence of the youth.

(5) He gets better food and other benefits which a hosteller can not dream of.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

(*P.M.A. Long Course*)

For :

(1) It is the best solution when we anticpate a threat from an enemy.

(2) In the modern world no country can maintain large standing armies.

(3) It saves money and labour.

(4) It spreads the ideas of nationalism in the growing minds of youngsters.

(5) It makes them healthy and active.

(6) It provides them with the right type of discipline.

Against :

(1) A child who is studious gets diverted by this compulsory training.

(2) Not all the boys take it seriously.

(3) It makes the war minded.

(4) When everyone is trained to handle a weapon, it may make a revolution.

(5) When all the nations preach peace, it may be a national waste to spend money for this which could be utilised for economic development.

BASIC EDUCATION

(P.M.A. Long Course)

For :

(1) Basic education is backed by people like Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

(2) The English system of education and its drawbacks are well known.

(3) The learning of 3 R's can only produce unemployment.

(4) Government has agreed to basic education in their attempts for educational reconstruction.

(5) By imparting basic education students come to know about their planning for future life.

(6) It solves the unemployment problem.

Against :

(1) Basic education is not suitable for an advancing nation.

(2) It stands in the way of training boys for specialisation in subjects other than technical

(3) It obstructs the study of arts and humanities which are essential for the world

(4) Basic education will only enable to reduce unemployment in the lower starta of society and not in the higher.

SHOULD STUDENTS TAKE PART IN POLITICS ?

(P.M.A. Long Course)

For :

(1) It is but correct to give students ideas of politics even in the early age.

(2) In a democracy, politics of the right spirit will only prove beneficial.

(3) It provides them with leadership qualities.

(4) It gives them the idea of nationality and a confidence to work for the nation.

(5) It makes them aware of the problems that face Pakistan, and to find our right solutions.

(6) They become ideal citizens by taking part in politics.

Against :

(1) Politics diverts the students' attention.

(2) It gives rise to strikes etc.

(3) An immature mind is not capable of knowing the full details of a particular party.

(4) Their exploitation by the selfish politicians is well known.

(5) Instead of becoming the best citizens they get into the most miserable conditions in life as a result of this.

WHO IS SUCCESSFUL ?

(P.M.A. Graduate Course)

One :

(I) *Intelligent, or*

(II) *Who is courageous, or*

(III) *Sympathetic.*

I—(1) Even from time immemorial courage has been the quality of a successful man.

(2) Courage can provide for the necessary confidence to face life.

(3) Where intelligence fails, courage can only save.

(4) For every profession courage is a must.

II—(1) What is the use of a huge body of flesh and blood without intelligence.

(2) We may compare it to an elephant and fox.

(3) Intelligence can only provide with the necessary confidence that has to come in turn from experience in life.

(4) Where courage and sympathy fail, this makes one successful in life.

III—(1) It is through sympathy one succeeds over another.

(2) Compassion is the best virtue.

(3) Mere intelligence or courage may not win anybody's heart.

(4) To err in human but to sympathise with him and pardon him is divine.

HAS MODERN SCIENCE ENHANCED MAN'S PRESTIGE ?

(P.M.A. Long Course)

For :

(1) Modern science has made us more civilised.

(2) It has made our lives happier.

(3) It has provided us with more comforts.

(4) It has made nations closer, thereby raising our prestige in all ways.

(5) It has been the story of Man's adventure in the life.

Against :

(1) Science has only been able to make us worried and unhappy.

(2) It has made us materialistic.

(3) It has made us savage as it enables us to devastate mankind even by dropping nuclear bombs.

(4) It has made us slaves of science.

(5) We have lost the Eden of prestige that we have been enjoying hitherto till modern science has shown itself on the sence.

SHOULD MEN AND WOMEN HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS OF DIVORCE ?

(P.M.A. Graduate Course)

For :

(1) The days of slavery for women are gone.

(2) In unhappy marriages we find that men are mostly responsible who have an attitude of 'masters over their wives'.

(3) It is always better to get separated for a woman than to remain under a brutal husband and hence she should be given equal rights.

(4) Our codified family laws have provisions for equal rights of divorce for both.

(5) It gives women a say in their own matter, which is a fundamental right that should be assured of.

Against :

(1) It will make for easy divorces.

(2) In practice, a woman never wants to get a divorce, since she is under the sole protection of her husband. And she finds many obstacles in living another marriede life.

(3) It not only makes easy for divorce but it will completely overrule the idea of compromise since many unpleasantnesses are short-lived family quarrels and there is every chance for patching up.

IS SCIENCE A CURSE OR A BOON ?

(P.M.A. Long Course)

Course :

(1) The evil effects of Science are the cause for the present day world unrest.

(2) It has helped arms race and power politics.

(3) The thereat of atom bomb and the Hiroshima affair are ringing in everyone's ears.

(4) This is no way out in preventing politicians using the scientific advancement for bad purposes.

(5) The advancement of Science has made the society complex and in the name of comforts we have lost our mental peace.

Boon :

(1) The advancement of Science has brought forth many comforts.

(2) It has brought men closer than ever.

(3) It has made human labour reduce to the minimum of machines.

(4) By the advancement of Science, man enjoys his life more than ever, we may say he has entered another Eden.

(5) The bad effects of Science are nothing but to be corrected and utilised for the betterment of human advancement (Many attempts that are being made may be discussed.)

STUDENTS AND STRIKES

(P.M.A. Long Course)

Causes :

(1) Present day education system has many flaws.

(2) Wrong idea of democracy that gives the student the impetus to fight for every problem.

(3) Crowded schools and colleges.

(4) Political parties having a hand in the students' organisations.

(5) Lack of experienced and able teachers.

(6) In a few cases at least the administration is also responsible for the strikes since that is the only way by which students get redress.

Remedies :

(1) Introduction of compulsory military training in schools and colleges.

(2) More of able teachers and less of students in the class, so that they may get good training.

(3) Keeping all political parties off the educational promises.

(4) Need for administrative reforms.

(5) More of extra-curricular activities like group discussions, play, dramatic associations etc. so that the energy is diverted for good purposes.

(6) More of mutual contacts between the teacher and the taught and a sympathetic outlook towards the students will solve the problem.

SHOULD MILITARY TRAINING BE INTRODUCED IN COLLEGES ?

(P.M.A. Long Course)

For :

(1) The present Indian threat has given us the clue to maintain a strong army.

(2) By training boys and girls they could be made the best citizens who indeed can serve the country.

(3) By imparting military training to them, they grow more national minded.

(4) They become more healthy, in mind and body.

(5) It unites the emotions of the boys as to Pakistan is one.

(6) The lack of discipline that we notice among boys, is corrected by such training.

Against :

(1) It will highly divert the attention of the student who is studious.

(2) In the present day, when we tend towards peaceful existence, it is wrong to train boys to be military minded.

(3) By teaching the art of firing one day a rebellion may easily come up.

(4) Just as one who learns to drive a car wants to drive whenever he gets an opportunity, a boy who learns the art of firing tries to get the first opportunity to fire at human or beast.

(5) It will be highly expensive for the Government.

PROHIBITION OF WINE

(P.M.A. Graduate Course)

For :

(1) The evils of drinks are well known.

(2) Muhammad Ali Jinnah the Father of the nation was an ardent preacher of prohibition.

(3) Wine and women are the causes for quarrels and hence man's downfall.

(4) Prohibition has been quite successful in many nations and also in Pakistan where it is in force.

(5) Alcohol is not suited for a country like Pakistan since it is a drink of the cold countries.

Against :

(1) From time immemorial wine was used in Pakistan.

(2) The evils of drink are more exaggerations.

(3) Government is receiving a big amount as tax from this industry and if it is prohibited, the Government's budget will go glim.

(4) Many people are employed for this purpose. By enforcing prohibition we may produce more unemployment.

(5) The illict liquor manufacturing in the country shows prohibition has been a failure.

(6) Some of the Pakistan is need alcohol due to its cold climate in winter.

FAMILY PLANNING

(P.M.A. Long Course)

For :

(1) The present day over-population.

(2) Over-population affects the economy of the country reducing the rates of human comforts and happiness.

(3) All the modern nations are backing this idea of family planning.

(4) The argument against family planning has to the instance of man-power is baseless when we have modern machineries and atomic power at our disposal.

(5) Science has so advanced that birth could be controlled effectively.

(6) It is only by good family planning that an under developed country can march ahead.

(7) It means healthy citizens happy in all respects.

Against :

(1) Family planning is against the law of nature and therefore there may be bad effects which research has not been able to refuse so far.

(2) It prevents us from having enough man-power for war, as well as for other purposes.

(3) The common man is never convinced of the idea.

(4) The common man cannot understand the technicalities of birth control and hence it results in failure.

WHICH BRINGS GREATER SUCCESS IN LIFE HARD WORK OR INTELLIGENCE

(P.M.A. Long-Caurse)

For hard work :

(1) Work, work, work had been the motto of many eminent men.

(2) However intelligent one is only hard work pays.

(3) Easy-goingness cannot win any laurels.

(4) Muhammad Ali Jinnah and others were ardent followers of hard work.

(5) Nobody has ever complained that hard work did not pay.

For intelligence :

(1) Intelligence is a valuable faculty in human being.

(2) It reduces hard work by half.

(3) Where hard work fails intelligence easily takes one through hurdles.

(4) An intelligent one can do far better if he has little hard work too.

(5) There is nothing impossible for an intelligent man in life.

TYRANNY OF FASHIONS

(P.M.A. Graduate Course)

1. Rousseau, the French political thinker, was right in declaring that man was born free but that he was everywhere in chains. Man has always been a slave of traditions, customs, conventions, ceremonies and rituals. Human beings are also the slaves of changing fashions.

2. Take the example of the cinema. It is true that people go to the cinema for entertainment. But it is equally true that people go to the cinema as part of a fashionable life. Regularly going to the cinema has acquired a certain prestige value in social circles.

3. What has been said about the cinema applies also to the theatre, dance and music concerts, and art exhibitions. Many people belonging to the upper classes go to attend musical concerts and art exhibitions, not because they have any real taste for, or understanding of, music and art but because they want to be "in the swim". They would feel backward if they were not to visit these shows and if they were not able to talk about them afterwards.

4. It is fashions in dress, however, that exercise the greatest tyranny over human beings. In this respect, even people of modest means feel impelled to obey changing fashions.

5. In matters of dress, women are much greater slaves to fashion than men. In recent year in Pakistan feminine fashions have been changing rapidly and have been followed by vast numbers of women with an equal rapidity. Examples of tight-fitting clothes, followed by loose dresses. In the West, more and more women are adopting the fashion of wearing mini-skirts.

6. Nor are men averse to fashions. Where male attire is concerned, our men and boys generally follow the western fashions. The example of drain-pipe trousers.

Fashions in dress may also be regarded as including hair styles. Many different kinds of hair styles are being followed by Pakistani women. Our young men have adopted the Beatles fashion of keeping long uncut hair, thus doing away with the need to visit a hair-cutting saloon for months.

8. For an unmarried girl to have a boy-friend is another part of modern fashions in the West. Not to have a boy-friend gives a feeling of inferiority. This fashion has spread to the higer social circles in Pakistan also.

9. The desire to follow fashions is but natural in the sophisticated world of today. But there are many people who, while not really feeling attracted by a certain fashion, have to follow it for fear of public opinion. The tyranny of fashions is thus very difficult to resist.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SELF-RELIANCE

(*Education Corps*)

1. Self-reliance or self-confidence is a very valuable quality. It is essential for any kind of achievement in this world.

2. Self-reliance implies a firm will and determination. A strong will strengthens self-reliance.

3. A dependence upon other people, or a perpetual expection of help from others, is a retarding factor in life. The tendency to depend upon others weaknes and undermines one's will-power.

4. Self-reliance is one of the most essential qualities of leadership. No leader can gain a following and no leader can inspire his followers with faith and confidence if he does not possess this quality.

5. Examples of great men and women whose achievements were due chiefly of self-reliance—Columbus, Joan of Arc, Abraham Lincoln, Flourence Nightingale, Sir Winston Churchill, and Mohammad Ali Jinnah.

6. Self-reliance is even more essential for communities and nations Pakistan is not a self-reliant nation. We have not yet learnt to stand on our own legs, at least in the economic sphere. We are, therefore, at a serious disadvantage. A self-reliant attitude would mean doing away with as much of foreign economic aid as possible. But, unfortunately, we are not self-reliance even where food is concerned.

OUR DUTY TO OUR NEIGHBOURS

(*P M A. Long Course*)

1. "Love thy neighbour" is a well-known precept.

2. We should always show due consideration and sympathy to our neighbours.

3. We should offer practical help to our neighbours when they need it. We should be ready to serve them as far as possible.

4. We should take care that we are not a nuisance to our neighbours in any way. We should keep our dogs under control ; we should not create any noise or disturbance ; we should not raise the pitch of our radio-sets ; and so on.

5. If our neighbours are in any way a nuisance to us, we should show patience and should protest only in a mild, friendly manner, instead of quarrelling or coming to blows, with them.

6. On the whole, we should guard against creating hostilities and antagonisms with our neighbours.

THE LIFE OF A SOLDIER

(P.M.A. Long Course)

1. A soldier's life is hard and tough. It demands exceptional endurance and stamina.

2. A soldier, especially during a war, should be prepared to go without food and sleep for days and days.

3. A soldier has to brave the extremes of climate. He cannot except physical comfort, must less luxury. He must face physical hardships of all kinds.

4. A soldier must acquire the qualities of punctuality and regularity.

5. Discipline is one of the foremost requirements of a soldier's life.

6. A soldier has to push family attachments into the background. His duty to his country comes first.

7. A soldier must always be prepared for death, sudden, violent death, painful death, etc.

8. A soldier has his compensations in the thrill that he experiences showing his gallantry and in the official and public recognition of his gallantry.

HOW ONE CAN SERVE ONE'S COUNTRY BEST

(P.M.A. Long Course)

1. The service of one's country consists not in having a mere abstract feeling of love for, and attainment to it, but on concrete action.

2. Different people can serve the country in different ways, depending upon their aptitudes.

3. Joining the army and to be prepared to die for the honour and integrity of one's country is one form of service, but one must have the required temperament and physical fitness for this kind of service.

4. Apart from an army career, one can serve one's country in the following manner.

(*a*) By working efficiently and honestly in whichever walk of life one may be.

(*b*) By contributing one's utmost to attaining the goal of the country's unity and integration.

(*c*) By co-operation with the government in its programmes of economic betterment of the country.

(*d*) By striving to stamp out corruption, smuggling, black-marketing and other malpractices.

(e) By co-operating whole-heartedly with social service organization in their programmes of effecting social reforms.

THE ADVANTAGES OF A UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

(P.M.A. Long Course)

1. The function of a University is to enlarge one's mind and broaden one's outlook on the world. The student by receiving higher knowledge of various subjects develops a genuine desire and eagerness for learning truth. His mind is awakened and stimulated to learn more and more. He also develops the capacity to think independently, reason well, argue effectively and criticize judiciously.

2. A University is not only a seat of learning but the house of culture. A University education is the best means of culture which consists in a capacity to reconcile opposite points of view, to examine every matter in a dispassionate, detached manner, to restrain one's temper in the most provoking situations, and to appreciate the best things of life.

3. A University also equips its students for social and political life. The various extra-curricular activities of a college debates, discussion groups, tea-parties, concerts, etc —go a long way in teaching students social manners and etiquette and the arts of speech-making and conversation. University education gives a certain polish and refinement to men and women.

4. Sports are an important part of a university education. Sports are an excellent means of building up health and character. The educative value of sports is very great.

5. Enduring friendships are made at a university. Friendships formed at a university have no taint of selfishness on either side and are therefore genuine.

IDEALS OF A GOOD EDUCATION

(P.M.A. Long Course)

1. A good education aims at the harmonious and balance development of all human faculties and powers.

2. A good education must impart considerable knowledge to a man, teach him, to think for himself, enlarge his mental horizon and develop his mental or intellectual powers. It must save him from being narrow-minded or bigoted, or fanatical. It must give him a secular and cosmopolitan outlook.

3. A good education must strengthen moral instincts and impulses, curb and restrain lawless desires, and teach a man the art of living in human society according to recognized values and principles.

4. A good education must reinforce the natural sympathies of a person, create in him a large fund of fellow-feeling, inspire him to deeds of charity and sacrifice, and make him love mankind in general.

5. A good education makes a man cultured and refined. It teaches him manners and etiquette. It makes him chivalrous.

6. A good education does not neglect the physical side of the human personality. It never loses sight of the truth of a sound mind in a sound body.

7. A good education must have a practical bias. Knowledge and learning are highly desirable, but if education does not enable a man to earn his livelihood and to maintain his family, it is of no use.

IDLENESS

(P.M.A. Graduate Course)

1. Idleness is, indeed, a curse and an evil. An idler is looked down upon in society and incurs the displeasure and criticism of everybody. An idler has no right to exist. Idleness is an anti-social habit.

2. Idleness is usually a temperamental quality in a man. A man inclined to idleness will live poorly rather than do active work to improve his financial condition. He will shirk work on the pretence that the work is difficult or that he is in a state of bad health.

3. In many cases, idleness is the accompaniment of wealth and prosperity. "The idle rich" is a well-known phrase. Having plenty of money, a prosperous man tends to become idle.

4. Idleness usually breeds mischief. One who is busy in one's duties or responsibilities finds no time to make mischief but an idler will start a false rumour, hatch an intrigue, plan somebody's ruin, or talk ill of others. An idle brain is a devil's workshop.

5. Idleness should be declared illegal because society is deprived of the services which idlers might render. When there is so much work to be done in the world, idleness is surely a crime.

6. The word "idleness" has been interpreted in a special sense by Stevenson. In that sense it dense it does not mean doing nothing at all but doing something which is not recognized by society as work. Interpreted thus, it includes quiet contemplation of the objects of Nature, playing upon a musical instrument, smoking a cigar, moving about on the roads with keen, observant eyes, making new acquaintances just for the fun of it, and so on. This kind of idleness is highly instructive and has, therefore, been defended and justified by Stevenson.

THE WORLD ACCORDING TO YOUR HEART'S DESIRE

(P.M.A. Graduate Course)

1. I want the world to be rid of the threat of war, the danger of complete annihilation, the conflict of "isms" and the tensions that have destroyed the joy of living.

2. I want poverty to be abolished and the standards of living to go up in the backward and under developed countries.

3. I also want the eradication of superstition, ignorance, illiteracy and fanaticism from the countries of the East.

4 I hate the continuance of imperialism of all kinds, the continuance of racial and social prejudices and the continuance of the capitalist class wherever it exists.

5. I do not wish the world to be communized because, however desirable communism may be regards its economic benefits, it destroys individual liberties and establishes a regimentation of life.

6. I want more leisure for human beings and less work, more recreations, more fun, more gaiety.

PAKISTAN FOR FIFTY YEARS HENCE

(P.M.A. Long Course)

1. It is possible to take a dark as well as a bright view of what the future has in store for our country. As, however, I am a person with an optimistic turn of mind, I feel inclined towards a bright vi w and think that Pakistan h s a glorious future.

2. In the next fifty years, Pakistan will have executed ten more Five-Year Plans. Allowing for the usual short-falls, Pakistan will by the end of that period be a highly industrialized nation with, at the same time, enough agricultural output to make it self-sufficient in respect of food.

3. Pakistan will no longer be a developing country, but a highly developed and prosperous nation with a satisfactory standard of living. Population control devices will prevent the country from becoming over-populated.

4. Militarily Pakistan will be strong enough to repel any attacks from any side and to maintain her territorial integrity.

5. There will be one hundred per cent literacy in the country and there will be little or on unemployment.

6. National intergration will have been fully achieved, and the people will have a keen feeling of the essential oneness of their country and culture

Against

1. A further cleavage will have against occured between the rich and the poor. The industrial development will make the rich people richer without bringing about a corresponding improvement in the condition of the poor.

2. The huge rise in population will create new problems and aggravate the existing problem food, housing, employment, health, etc.

3. The linguistic conflicts will have greatly strengthened the forces of disintegration in the country.

4. The increase in Pakistan's military strength will have been offset by a still greater increase in the armed might of India which is now has the secret of the atom bomb in her possession.

THE MODERN WOMAN

(P.M.A. Long Course)

1. The modern woman presents many differences from her sister, of say, fifty years ago. The world has undergone numerous changes but one of the most remarkable changes that the world has witnessed in modern time is the changes in Eve.

2. The fair sex today has achieved a measure of independence that women in the past could never have dreamed of. The modern woman has won her political and social rights.

3. Woman today is almost the equal of man in different spheres of life. Disabilities based on sex no longer exist. Woman is no longer subjected to male exploration except in the backward countries of Asia and Africa.

4. The modern woman possesses a degree of self confidence and self-reliance which is astonishing. She has shed her shyness, her difference and her sense of inferiority to man. She has developed qualities of courage, initiative and leadership.

5. But we must not blind ourselves to the faults which the modern woman has developed. The shedding of shyness has led to the loss of modesty. Freedom has degenerated into licence.

6. The modern woman is often irresponsible, superficial, lacking in any depth of feeling or sentiment. She often proves to be an indefferent mother and a careless wife.

7. The modern woman is often a butterfly who merely takes pleasure in making a display of her physical charms and in captivating the hearts of men. She tends to become a first. She utilises her new found freedom in having many lovers, generally one after the other, but sometimes simultaneously.

8. But when all is said and done, the modern woman has a certain fascination and charm which Eve never had before.

THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF WAR

(P.M.A. Long Course)

1. War is an economic disaster. Its economic consequences are far-reaching and very unpleasant.

2. War paralyses* industry. The only industries that flourish during war are the manufacture of deadly weapons and the making of orphans and widows. It takes years and years for a nation to restore its industrial production to hormalcy after a war.

3. War hinders agricultural development. Standing crops are often destroyed. An acute food shortage generally follows in the wake of war.

4. Trade and commerce are completely disrupted by war. Nations become heavily indebted and they take many years to repay war debts.

5. Unemployment on a large scale is the inevitable aftermath of war. Inflation prevails everywhere.

6. War leads to a general improvement of the world. The destruction of property and wealth is so vast and indiscriminate that it takes years and years to make up for those losses. War economically cripples not only the defeated but also the victorious nations. We have still not recovered from the terrible economic effects of World War II.

EDUCATION VALUE OF HOBBIES

(P.M.A Long Course)

1. The hobby of reading stimulates the mind, adds to one's knowledge and develops one's thinking power. (Examples ofcertain suitable books for reading)

2. A hobby like gardening adds to one's general information about plants, flowers, etc. One learns as to which plants and flowers and vegetables grow in which season. One can then talk about these things with authority. It is surely a kind of education to know something about the vegetable world

3. Stamp-collecting possesses a historical interest. Stamps of different countries and of different designs throw much light on how the minds of people have been working.

4. Photography makes a person precise and careful. It also enhances his artistic sense.

5. Painting, music and dancing satisfy the aesthetic sense, have a refining effect, and stimulate the creative faculty.

6. Travelling is also a hobby with some people. The educative value of travel is recognized by all.

7. Thus different hobbies educate a man in different ways.

MAN WAS NOT BORN TO LIVE BY BREAD ALONE

(P.M.A. Long Course)

1. Bread is indispensable for human life, but bread alone is not enough Bread is the food for the body only.

2. But man has not only a body. He has a mind, too. The mind demands its own food, namely, study, thinking, meditation, discussion, etc.

3. Man has a soul also. The soul needs its own food, which is religion.

4. Furthermore, man has a heart. He has emotions and feelings and an aesthetic* sense. Food for the heart is equally essential, beauty of Nature, music, dancing, or fine arts.

LATEST MASTERLY BOOKS

FOR

C. S. S & P. C. S.

AND

COMBINED DEFENCE SERVICES EXAMINATIONS

Ready for Despatch

1.	A Book of General Knowledge ...	Rs.	40.00
2.	General Knowledge Refresher ...	Rs.	50.00
3.	General Knowledge (Questions & Answers)	Rs.	35.00
4.	Who's Who (Pakistan & World) ...	Rs.	35.00
5.	Everyday Science ...	Rs.	35.00
6.	Objective Type Everyday Science ...	Rs.	16.00
7.	General English Digest ...	Rs.	35.00
8.	Applied Grammar ...	Rs.	20.00
9.	How to Improve your English ...	Rs.	20.00
10.	Dictionary of Idioms & Phrases ...	Rs.	20.00
11.	Advanced Essays ...	Rs.	35.00
12.	Current Essays ...	Rs.	40.00
13.	Art of Precis Writing ...	Rs.	25.00
14.	Essentials of Interview ...	Rs.	22.00
15.	Test of Reasoning ...	Rs.	30.00
16.	Super Intelligence Test ...	Rs.	20.00
17.	Intelligence Test & Logical Reasoning ...	Rs.	16.00
18.	Best I. Q. ...	Rs.	20.00
19.	You & Your I.Q. & Intelligence Tests ...	Rs.	20.00
20.	Intelligence & Aptitude Tests ...	Rs.	35.00
21.	I.S.S.B. Interviews, Psycho. Test ...	Rs.	35.00
22.	Group Discussions ...	Rs.	16.00
23.	Word Power ...	Rs.	20.00
24.	جدید معلومات ...	Rs.	25.00
25.	معلومات کی دنیا ...	Rs.	25.00
26.	رنگ برنگی معلومات ...	Rs.	25.00
27.	زہانت کا امتحان ...	Rs.	25.00

GROUP DISCUSSIONS Price : Rs. 16.00